



78-1
16

LIBRARY
OF THE
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,

AT
PRINCETON, N. J.

DONATION OF
SAMUEL AGNEW,
OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Letter.

March 25th. 1858.

No.

Case,

SCC

Division

Shelf,

2338

Secti.

Book,

No.



Regula quidem fidei una omnino est, sola immobilis, et irreformabilis, credendi scilicet in unicum Deum omnipotentem, mundi conditorem, et Filium ejus Jesum Christum, natum ex Virgine Maria, crucifixum sub Pontio Pilato, tertia die resuscitatum a mortuis, receptum in Cælis, sedentem nunc ad dexteram Patris, venturum judicare vivos et mortuos per carnis etiam resurrectionem. Tertullian. de Virginibus Velandis. p. 173. Ed. Rigaltii. Parisiis. 1695.

DISCOURSES

ON THE

DIVINE UNITY;

OR,

A Scriptural Proof and Demonstration of the One Supreme Deity of the God and Father of all; and of the subordinate Character and inferior Nature of our Lord Jesus Christ; with a Confutation of the Doctrine of a Co-equal and Consubstantial Trinity in Unity; and a full reply to the objections of Trinitarians.

By WILLIAM CHRISTIE, JUNIOR,
Merchant in MONTROSE.

MONTROSE:

Printed by GEORGE JOHNSTON,
M,DCC,LXXXIV.

THE

P R E F A C E.

THE Christian Religion as delivered to mankind by Christ and his Apostles, and exhibited in the sacred books of the New Testament, is a plain intelligible system of doctrines, easy to be believed; and calculated to produce piety and holiness of life. But this pure and rational institution did not long remain uncorrupted. In the very times of the Apostles, the mystery of iniquity began to work; and became still more visible after their decease. For the three first centuries however, the belief of one God the Father supreme over all, was in a great measure preserved among Christians. The ecclesiastical writers of those ages, although they used some unscriptural and unjustifiable expressions concerning Jesus Christ the Son of God; did yet observe a great and remarkable distinction betwixt him, and the God and Father of all. Upon the whole, their testimony is not favourable to the modern plan of Orthodoxy; as some learned Trinitarian writers themselves have acknowledged. The doctrine of a co-equal and consubstantial Trinity, grew up only by degrees: and it was the work of ages to bring it to its present pitch of absurdity. That ancient and venerable creed, commonly called the Apostles' creed, which with no material variation was
received

received in all the primitive churches, is strictly Unitarian, and is an undeniable proof of what the sentiments of Christians originally were; concerning God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit. In this form of sound words, the Father Almighty alone has the title of God. Jesus Christ is styled his only Son, but no characters of divinity whatever are applied to him. The Holy Spirit is mentioned together with the forgiveness of sins, and the resurrection of the body. &c. and there is nothing in this creed that implies the personality of the Holy Spirit. Happy would it have been for the Christian world, if this simple profession of faith had been always adhered to. How much rancour, strife, contention, schism, and persecution, might have been prevented. The first council of Nice however thought proper to make another; and introduced several absurd and unscriptural phrases, which had never before been imposed upon Christians. These Nicene Fathers notwithstanding, either durst not, or did not incline to depart from the ancient doctrine altogether. They began their creed therefore in the usual invariable form, "I believe in one God the Father, &c." for the notion of a triune Deity was not yet so generally received, as to obtain a place in a creed. And even the decisions of the council of Nice itself, gave offence to many; and were overthrown by the Arians in several succeeding councils. The largest general council that ever met in the world, viz. that of Ariminum, and many others besides, decided clearly in favour of Arianism; and for a considerable time the christian world was divided betwixt the Homousian and Arian parties; and either the one or the other prevailed, just as the reigning Emperor happened to be affected. At last, the church of Rome having espoused the cause of the former; and a succession of Trinitarian Emperors having followed one another; the Arians, and every other species of Unitarians were effectually crushed; and by dint of penal edicts, fines, imprisonments, and executions, the present glorious system of Orthodoxy was established.

The

The faith of the church however did not arrive at the last summit of perfection all at once. It was improved and amended in various councils; the council of Constantinople enlarged the creed of that of Nice; and other clerical assemblies added still further embellishments. † The opinions of Apollinarius, Nestorius, and Eutyches, gave occasion for several more articles; until at last (probably about the end of the fifth century) some unknown author put all these admirable improvements together; by forging a creed under the name of Athanasius; which surpassed every thing the world ever saw; and although buried in obscurity for a long time after its birth became at length the standard of Orthodoxy and sound faith. ‡ This creed is so completely absurd and contradictory; and displays such a manifest renunciation of the faith of Christ; that the acute and metaphysical geniuses of the schoolmen, of the tenth, eleventh, and succeeding centuries, were hardly able to improve it. They have however if possible darkened the subject still farther, and made it more unintelligible. In the mean time the Papal power increased and bore down all opposition, free inquiry was prohibited, the Latin became a dead language, understood only by the learned, and the scriptures were not permitted to be translated into any of the new vulgar tongues; the worship of the Virgin Mary; the invocation of Saints and Angels, the use of images, relics, &c. and endless superstitions too tedious to name every

† The article in the Nicene creed, relative to the Holy ghost, stood originally thus. "I believe in the Holy-ghost" without any thing more. The council of Constantinople added these words, "the Lord and giver of life who proceedeth from the Father, &c. And the words, "and the Son," were afterwards inserted in it.

‡ Vigilus Tapsensis is supposed by some to have been the author of the Athanasian creed; but whoever was the author of it, it has been clearly proved by learned men that it was not the composition of Athanasius; and Dr Waterland himself fairly owns it.

every where prevailed. And that nothing might be left to complete the ruin of Christianity they made a God out of a piece of bread; and abjectly worshipped the Baker's work. During this long period of Popish delusion, and monkish darkness, ecclesiastical history informs us of some, who would not receive the mark of the beast; but still preserved a sense of the proper Unity of God, and the purity of the christian faith. And perhaps if we had more authentic records of these times, we might find the number of these persons greater than is generally imagined. For the severity of the clerical power was such, that people of this description were driven into corners, and were obliged to keep an awful silence.

Such was the state of the religious world; so corrupted and depraved was that church which Jesus Christ himself established, when Luther in the beginning of the sixteenth century made his first appearance, and called for a reformation. Some attempts had been made in this good work many years before, by Wicklief and others; but the times did not favour them. It must be owned, that the Christian world is under the greatest obligations to Luther, Zuinglius, Calvin, Cranmer, Knox, and others, for removing many of the corruptions of Popery; and their memories ought ever to be revered on that account. It is only to be regretted that their reformation was partial and incomplete; that they did not go deep enough: that they did not probe the wound that Christianity had received to the bottom, and perform a radical cure. The reformers laid the scriptures open to the world, they took away the idolatrous worship and invocation of the Virgin Mary, Angels, and Saints; set aside Transubstantiation, images, indulgences, and many superstitious and useless ceremonies, &c. and may they ever be applauded for so doing: but left behind I speak it with infinite sorrow, they left behind; the source and cause of the whole disorder, a Trinity of divine co-equal persons or intelligent agents, the Divinity of Christ, and his equality with the God and Father of all;

all; and the incarnation of God in human flesh. These doctrines, which appear to me to be the most destructive and pernicious part of Popery; they did not examine with sufficient accuracy: but implicitly received them from the fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, and the Popish schoolmen; as the most sacred and important of all truths, transferred them into what is called (but improperly,) the reformed religion; and even persecuted with the utmost severity, such of their contemporaries, as were more enlightened and better informed in these respects than themselves. And this brings me to speak of Servetus, Lælius, and Faustus Socinus, Andreas Dudithius, Franciscus Davides, &c. who all of them appeared in the same age, and the two first were contemporaries of Luther and Calvin. These men had an equal if not superior title to the appellation of reformers. Like Luther and Calvin, they had been educated in the errors of Popery; and like them they also were superior to the prejudices of education, yielded to the force of evidence, departed from the communion of the church of Rome; and carried the reformation much farther than Luther and Calvin had done. The tenets of these two last mentioned reformers, had indeed the good fortune to be patronised by states and princes, and established in various countries: while our Unitarian reformers met with little else but opposition and persecution. But the patronage and public countenance that the one party received in different states and kingdoms; is no more a proof of the truth of their religious system, than the establishment and prevalence of Popery in other countries, is a proof of the truth of the tenets of Roman Catholics. Nor can the repeated discouragements, mortifications, and fierce opposition, that our honoured Unitarian brethren suffered at the time of the reformation and for long after, be urged as an argument against their principles, any more than the trials, troubles, and sufferings, that our Lord and his apostles underwent in publishing the gospel, and the hostility of the civil powers and the greatest part of the world to Christianity, for
three

three centuries after Christ, can be urged as an argument against the truth of the Christian religion. If a comparison is made betwixt the characters, abilities, and literary qualifications, of our Unitarian reformers, and those who are called orthodox; it will not turn out to the disadvantage of the former. Servetus was a Physician, a man of genius, learning, and piety; who wrote several treatises against the Trinity at a very early period; and at last sealed his doctrine with his blood. And Calvin has left an indelible blot upon his own memory, by beginning and conducting the prosecution against him, and consenting to his death. Lælius Socinus was one of the most learned persons of his age, eminently skilled in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, a man of great modesty, and virtue, who infused his principles into many, and died peaceably a voluntary exile from his native country at Zurich in Switzerland. Faustus Socinus nephew of the preceding, although not so profoundly learned as his Uncle; was yet a man of competent learning, and great good sense, as appears from his writings. He profited much from the papers that Lælius had bequeathed him, containing remarks and critical observations on the scriptures, and made use of them in the composition of his works. He was a man of high birth, descended from an ancient and noble family; which was connected with some of the most eminent persons in Italy. He enjoyed the friendship of the grand Duke of Tuscany, and might have spent his days with distinction and applause at the court of Florence; then the politest, and most enlightened in arts and literature, in Europe. Yet all these advantages he nobly sacrificed for the cause of God and truth, renounced the society of the great and learned, lost his paternal estate, retired to Basil in Switzerland, where he completed his studies; and from thence went to Transylvania and Poland, and solicited an admittance into those churches which acknowledged only one God the Father. He spent the remainder of his days in these countries, became an eminent labourer in the true church of God which flourished there, and was indefatigable

in his endeavours to promote the cause of Unitarianism; which had made a considerable progress in these parts of the world, before his coming there. Andreas Dudithius, was a man of fine genius, a most accomplished scholar, and very assiduous in his endeavours to extend the knowledge of God in the world. Franciscus Davides, was an eminent Unitarian minister in Transylvania, and had been an useful instrument in building up the church of God; but in consequence of an unhappy dispute concerning the worship of Jesus Christ, with Blandrata and Socinus, he ended his days in prison; for which Socinus has been blamed, but he disclaimed his having any hand in the commitment of Davides, although it must be owned he carried his zeal against him and others to an unjustifiable length. These persons and many others besides in the sixteenth century, whose names the brevity I am obliged to observe at present will not permit me to mention, exerted their best endeavours to restore the belief of the divine Unity, and restore the true worship of God. And although their attempts were unsuccessful in various places, yet their writings and labours were of signal use, and produced a conviction in the minds of many candid and unprejudiced persons. The Unitarian doctrine prevailed most in Poland, and Transylvania, where it enjoyed a free toleration, and many churches were established, and people of different ranks and stations became converts to it. The Unitarians erected schools and seminaries of learning, and many great critics and able interpreters of scripture appeared among them, whose valuable writings the world yet enjoys the benefit of; and whose distinguished skill in the scriptures has been acknowledged by their adversaries themselves. About the middle of the last century, the Unitarians were deprived of the toleration they possessed in Poland, and were obliged either to leave the country or change their religion: the former of which many of them did. The other sects of Protestants joined with the Roman Catholics in getting this cruel and unjust law enacted; and have since deservedly smarted under

under the rod of the Papists in their turn. The toleration however was continued in Transylvania, and the Unitarian churches subsist there to this very day, and also in Prussia on the borders of Poland. Those Unitarians who left Poland on account of their religion contributed to spread the knowledge of the truth in other countries, particularly in Holland where they had religious assemblies. In England there have been persons who have held Unitarian sentiments since the time of the reformation. But the principle made no great progress until the middle of the last century, when Mr. Biddle appearing an advocate for it, and writing ably on the subject; brought over several persons to the acknowledgement of the truth. The labours of that learned and good man have not been lost; the seed which he sowed has grown up and flourished, and the candle which he lighted has never been extinguished. The excellent, public-spirited, and benevolent Mr. Firmin, the disciple of Biddle, contributed also greatly to advance the Unitarian doctrine in our sister kingdom: and some of the most eminent Philosophers, the greatest geniuses, and most able scriptural critics that England has produced for near this century past, have been Unitarians, either of the Arian or Socinian denomination. The Trinitarian cause is daily losing ground amongst fair and candid enquirers, who apply themselves to the study of the scriptures with unbiassed minds: and even many of those who groan under the fetters of subscriptions and articles, would now be glad to be free of these incumbrances; of which the petition presented to parliament several years ago, by upwards of two hundred respectable clergymen of the church of England is a sufficient proof. Thus the Unitarian cause has had a succession of learned and illustrious advocates, from the reformation down to the present times; and as it is the very original system of Christianity which our Lord and his Apostles delivered to the world, it must sooner or later prevail in spite of all opposition. The Protestant reformed religion, as it appears in the thirty nine articles of the church of England, and confession

profession of faith of the church of Scotland, and in other churches, either at home or abroad, formed upon the same plan, is only a miserable composition, an imperfect medium, betwixt Popery and true christianity. For he only can be called a real and consistent Protestant who adheres solely to the scriptures; and protests against all the corruptions that have been introduced into religion; and that system only deserves the title of the reformed religion, which exhibits the faith of Christ as it was once delivered to the Saints: thoroughly purified from, and entirely divested of, all those additions and adulterations which have been incorporated with it. Those who reject some corruptions and retain others, are only Protestants by halves; and the reformation they have effected and established, is only a defective, partial, and inadequate one; which must be further pursued before any great and valuable end can be answered by it. No power on earth has any right to make laws in matters purely religious, to restrain the progress of free enquiry, to interpret the scriptures authoritatively; and to impose its own sense of them upon others. Christ's kingdom is not of this world: and his subjects are accountable to him alone, for their faith and religious profession; and are not amenable to any human tribunal. When civil governors and legislators, deserting their proper sphere of action, presume to lay restraints upon conscience; and to deny that unlimited toleration which is the common right of all mankind in the important concerns of religion, they act an unjust and tyrannical part; and their arbitrary decrees ought not to be obeyed. A true christian, a consistent protestant, will not resign the suggestions of his own conscience, the dictates of his own understanding, the rights of his own private judgement, to any power either civil or ecclesiastical on earth. The decisions of the council of Nice, the council of Trent, the Synod of Dort, the Assembly of Divines that sat at Westminster, an English Convocation, or a Scotch General Assembly, will be considered by him in the very same light, viz. as the words of men and not as the words

words of God. He will try them all by the law and the testimony, and will receive or reject them, just as he finds them agreeable or not to that only sufficient rule. He will call no man Father but God, and no man Master but Christ. This is the course that a Christian and a Protestant ought to take, and those who act a contrary part, and blindly and implicitly follow the principles of their education and the opinions of their ancestors without enquiry or examination, hardly deserve to be called by these honourable appellations. As their religion is not the effect of conviction, free choice, and reflection; but is caused merely by the customs and prevailing notions of their own country, they are entitled to no approbation, even tho' they should be accidentally in the right. For if the providence of God had fixed their birth in other ages, or in different parts of the world; they would have followed the multitude in the same irrational manner; and never called in question the sentiments that generally prevailed. If they had existed, at the time that Christianity was first promulgated, they would have been Pagans, and have rejected the doctrines of Christ and his Apostles. If they had been born in France, Spain, or Italy, they would have been Papists, if in Turkey, or Persia, Mohammedans, if in Tartary, they would have adored the grand Lama; and if in China, they would have followed the idolatry that there prevails, been disciples of Confucius, and worshipped the statues of their ancestors, &c. It is obvious therefore, that it is incumbent upon all persons who would wish to guard against error, when they arrive at the years of discretion, to enquire after truth as far as their circumstances and opportunities will permit; and if this is done in a serious and impartial manner, it is all that can justly be required of any person. For no man can be blamed for those mistakes that are unavoidable; we are only culpable when we indolently acquiesce in prevailing and popular opinions, and contemptuously reject light and evidence when it is afforded us. The scripture is not wanting in exhortations to excite us to this

manly

manly and indispensable duty of free inquiry, 1 Thes. v. 21. "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." 1 John iv. 1 "Beloved, believe not every spirit; but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world." And the Jews of Berea are commended (Acts xvii. 11.) as more noble than those of Thessalonica, because, "they searched the scriptures daily, whether these things were so;" that is they did not hastily reject, nor yet tamely receive the doctrine of the Apostle, but examined it by the scriptures of the Old Testament, and determined their assent accordingly. From these passages of holy writ, it is apparent, that fair and impartial enquiry is a duty prescribed by our most holy religion. We ought to prove all opinions that we have access and opportunity to examine, and hold fast only that which is good. As many false prophets and delusive teachers have gone forth into the world, in different ages, and our own not excepted, we cannot be sure, but that some of those we must admire and approve, may be of that number, and that others whom we have been taught to consider as erroneous and heretical, may be true teachers; we must therefore try the spirits, that is, examine the pretensions of each party, and not believe any without putting their doctrines to the test of reason and the word of God. For a conduct of this kind, the Bereans above mentioned were highly applauded, as noble, ingenuous, and liberal-minded persons; and surely those who neglect to imitate their good example, may be styled ignoble, tame, groveling, illiberal people; either ignorantly and unreasonably prejudiced against opinions which they have never calmly examined; or solely engrossed with secular cares and pursuits, and carelessly following the multitude, without giving themselves the trouble to enquire whither their religious tenets be founded in truth or error.

The author of the following discourses, being born of Presbyterian parents, was educated in the principles of the church of Scotland; but saw reason pretty early in life to call in question some of her doctrines; and as years and know-
ledge

ledge increased, his objections to her religious creed, and his convictions of its erroneousness, became still more numerous and powerful. What gave him the most uneasiness was the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity. He discovered with concern, that the Confession of Faith of the church of Scotland, which all her ministers are obliged to assent to, held forth the notion of three eternal, distinct, divine persons, or intelligent agents, equally infinite in all perfections: in express opposition to the sacred scriptures, which affirm that there is but one God the Father of whom are all things, that the Father is above all, through all, and in us all, and is the only true God; and that Jesus Christ and all other beings, are the subjects, creatures, and servants, of this great and only Sovereign of the Universe. This doctrine of a triune Deity, together with that of the incarnation of God, and of two natures in Jesus Christ, the church of Scotland in common with the other Protestant establishments, derived from that mother of abominations the church of Rome; and has asserted them in various places of her Confession of Faith, Larger and Shorter catechisms, and Sum of saving knowledge, in terms as express and decisive as the Athanasian creed itself. The author therefore having maturely and deliberately considered the subject, found he could no longer with a good conscience remain in the communion of a church, where a false Popish Deity was acknowledged; in place of the living and only true God the Father: and did therefore several years ago withdraw from the church of Scotland, chiefly on that account. He would gladly have joined himself to any other society, in which the purity of the Christian faith was professed; but could find none such in the place where he lived. The Episcopal party was as strictly Trinitarian as the Presbyterians: and their liturgy (although containing many excellent things in other respects,) being formed on a tritheistic plan, was still more offensive to an Unitarian than the worship of the church of Scotland. The smaller sects and parties in this part of the world, were also all Trinitarians in one form

form or other. So that the author was constrained for a considerable while to live by himself, without enjoying the benefit of public or social worship at all. At last having the good fortune to meet with some persons, who professed sentiments similar to his own, a small society was formed about two years ago upon an Unitarian plan. This little church takes the scriptures alone for its guide, and acknowledges no human articles or confessions of faith whatever. Its leading tenets are derived from the sacred source of the word of God, and are as few and simple as can well be imagined; and consist of the following articles, viz. " That there is one God the Father supreme over all; that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God and Saviour of the world, that the mercy and benevolence of the Deity our heavenly Father, is not restricted and confined to a few, but extends to all his rational offspring, that there shall be a resurrection from the dead, a general judgement, and a future state; in which men shall be rewarded or punished according to their works. These are the great outlines of our religious system; and many points of Theology, which have been warmly debated and zealously enforced by other parties of Christians, are by us left to the private judgement of every individual member of our society, according to his light, discernment, and knowledge; and no person is permitted to impose his own sentiments upon another, in regard to topics that have not been decided upon by the society at large. The profession of the divine Unity, or the one sole Godhead of the Father, being the tenet that the most distinguishes this society from any other in this part of the world, the discourses which follow, were delivered when it was first opened and made public, in order to make the principle better known, and if possible to gain the assent of Christians to it. With the same view and intention they are now published and given to the world. Whether they will be attended with any good effect or not must be left to time. These discourses are in substance the same as they were originally delivered; but the author

has

has abridged them in some parts, and enlarged them in others; and has supported his own sentiments in some places by quotations from eminent Biblical critics and commentators; and in others has given frequent extracts from the writings of those learned and excellent persons, who have been witnesses for God and his truth, and trod the path of Unitarianism before him. To their valuable writings he acknowledges himself much indebted, for many good arguments, and illustrations of the sacred records. He has endeavoured to express himself in the plainest manner, so as to make his meaning level to every capacity. The author has seen occasion in some instances to rectify our present English version where it is erroneous; and in others to depart from the common reading of the Greek Testament altogether, and and have recourse to the authority of manuscripts, the best and most accurate editions, and the oldest and most approved versions. But he has never done so without assigning his reasons, and producing sufficient vouchers and authorities.

There are some who affect to decry all critical emendations of this kind, and would persuade us that the Greek text as it appears in the common editions of the New Testament, is quite correct; and that our English version is so perfect as to stand in need of no amendment. But a very small acquaintance with the critical history of the New Testament, is sufficient to confute this absurd assertion. The text of the Greek Testament from which our common editions are drawn, was settled upwards of two hundred years ago, from a very imperfect collation of manuscripts by Stephens and Beza. And our English version was made from this text, about the beginning of the last century: consequently, whatever mistakes had been inserted into the one, must also be found in the other; for the copy could not be more perfect than its original. In the course of more than one hundred and sixty years, that have elapsed since our present translation was finished, much light has been thrown on the scriptures by the united labours of many
great

great critics and commentators; and a far more complete and accurate collation of manuscripts has been performed than that accomplished by Stephens and Beza. The celebrated Alexandrian manuscript, one of the most ancient in the world was not in their time known in Europe; and many Mss. in Italy, Germany, and England, were not consulted at all; and even some of those that were then collated, appear from the scrutinies they have since undergone, not to have been examined with a proper degree of accuracy. Dr Mill, who lived about a century after our present English bible was translated, was the first that ever presented the world with any very considerable number of different readings. The number he has collected have been computed to amount to thirty thousand, many of which are trifling, but some are of great importance, and supported by the authority of the best manuscripts, the ancient versions, Fathers &c Kuster who reprinted Mill's edition, increased the number of readings, and Bengelius added to those of Kuster. Professor Wettstein produced a great many more, and has given the world the most elaborate edition of the Greek Testament ever published: and the learned Griesbach has exhibited still more variations, and informs us that the laborious task of collation is not yet fully completed. Many learned men also in different countries, besides the collators themselves, have been usefully employed in examining and ascertaining with singular care and skill the authority of Greek manuscripts; and in passing their judgement on the value and importance of the various readings which have been presented to the public. What the learned persons above mentioned have done to the New Testament, Dr Kennicott has done to the Old, and by himself and with the assistance of others, has collated upwards of six hundred Hebrew manuscripts, besides some very early and scarce printed editions, and from these has drawn about one hundred thousand various readings. The merits of this great work have not yet been fully tried, but amongst so great a number of variations, some must undoubtedly be of great consequence; and Dr Lowth the present Bishop of London; a very

competent

competent judge, celebrates the work very much, and by the assistance that it afforded him in his new valuable translation of Isaiah, has restored several words that were lost out of that Prophet; and rectified the translation in many places, that had either no sense at all before, or an erroneous sense. It is beyond all controversy therefore, that our present English translation of the Old and New Testament is faulty in several places, and requires emendation: and I might bring a cloud of witnesses to prove this, were it not a thing so palpably known, that no man of learning and candour will call it in question. Now therefore, when by the providence of God and the exertions of the learned, more light has come into the world, are we to love darkness rather than light? Are we to sit down contented with an English version that is defective in some places, redundant in others, and differs in several respects from the best and most valuable manuscripts? Are we to pronounce this version authentic, forbid any amendment of it, and prevent any appeal to the originals, as the Roman Catholics do with respect to the vulgate; although by the bye the vulgate is in some places of great importance a better version than our own? How preposterous is a conduct of this kind, and also how dangerous! For although our English version was sufficient for the salvation of our ancestors, who had no way of obtaining a better: yet it may not be sufficient for ours, if we reject all the light that criticism affords for its correction and amendment.

I shall just mention before I conclude this preface, that some of these discourses are much longer than others; and that this is occasioned by the nature of the subject, and the plan the author laid down; and that the Greek and Hebrew quotations are printed in Roman characters, as no types in the original ones could in this place be procured. The author also apologizes to his readers for the indifferent manner in which his book is printed; and he readily acknowledges the very great imperfections of the type which must be evident to every person. But he hopes that they will excuse this defect, and consider rather the useful and important matter that his performance contains, than the disagreeable form in which it appears.

DISCOURSES ON THE DIVINE UNITY.

DISCOURSE I.

John Chap. xvii ver. 3 And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

TH E S E words are part of that excellent and fervent prayer, which Jesus our amiable Saviour and heavenly instructor, poured forth to his God and Father, previous to his entering upon the melancholy scene of his sufferings and death.

Although from the accounts the Evangelists have left us, we find our Lord frequently engaged in the sacred and necessary duty of prayer; and Luke in particular mentions that on a certain occasion he continued all night in prayer to God; and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews takes notice, that in the days of his flesh, he offered up supplications and prayers, with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death: † yet sometimes we have no accounts at all, and at other times very short and general ones, of the matter and substance of these prayers. But in this prayer which the Apostle John records, and of which our text forms a part, we have a complete and entire specimen of the devotions of Jesus.

The words of our text contain a very important speculative truth, viz. That the knowledge of God and Christ; or the different characters and relations which they stand in to us, is necessary to the obtaining of eternal life. • This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. § It is obvious to every one's consideration who takes

† Heb v. 7.

§ The Cambridge Ms. reads kai hon aposteilas Jesou Christon eis ton kosmon touton—and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent into this world.

takes the words of our text in their just and natural sense, that the Father is here styled, and that by our Lord himself the only true God; and Jesus Christ is distinguished from him under the character of one that he hath sent, or as his messenger, legate, or ambassador. This text therefore has ever been held deservedly dear by those who assert and maintain the proper unity of God, and that he is the Father only. On the other hand, those who oppose this important truth, and affirm that there are a plurality of co-equal and consubstantial persons in the Godhead, have endeavoured to weaken and explain away its natural and genuine meaning, and put a forced and arbitrary construction upon it. Before therefore we attempt to ground any argument upon this text, or raise any doctrine from it, it seems necessary to take some notice of their objections to our interpretation.

The first we shall mention is, that the words are capable of being rendered differently from the Greek, and instead of this is life eternal, that they might know thee the Father the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent; they may be rendered say they, this is life eternal that they might know thee the Father, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent the only true God, i. e. that both are the only true God. But sure, he that is capable of reading a single verse of the original will despise this translation; and the mere English reader by attending to the coherence of words, and the natural meaning of the context, may be satisfied that it is a most forced and unnatural one. † And to say the truth

† Le Clerc has a sensible note upon this passage as follows. “ Hina ginōskōsi se ton monon alethinon theon kai hon apesteilas Jesoun Christon. Verte; ut cognoscant te qui es solus verus Deus; et Jesum, qui est Christus quem misisti; aut et Jesum quem misisti, qui est Christus. Articulus enim TON debet repeti ante Christum. Perinde est ac si Infinitivo rem exprimas, hoc modo; ut cognoscant te quidem esse solum verum Deum, Jesum vero esse Messiam

truth some of the more learned Trinitarians do not insist upon it, but fairly own that the Father is here styled the only true God, they attempt however to evade the force of this text by other methods.

The Father they tell us has here the title of the only true God, in opposition to Idols, or the false Gods whom the Heathens worshipped; but not in exclusion of the Son our Lord Jesus Christ, who is true God as well as the Father; and as a proof of this they quote, 1 Ep. of John, Chap. v. 20. "And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true; even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life. Little children, keep yourselves from Idols." In answer to this we readily grant, that Idols or false Gods are certainly excluded by the Father's being here styled the only true God. But then, this is nothing to the purpose, for the word **ONLY** here made use of, not only excludes Idols, but every thing that is not the Father from being the true God. And our Lord Jesus Christ is plainly distinguished from the only true God, and characterised as one that he hath sent. In regard to the above quoted passage from the 1 Epistle of John, if we read it as it stands in the Greek without the word **EVEN**, which has been injudiciously inserted by our translators in the 20th verse; we shall find that it is the Father, and not the Son, that is there called the true God. The passage ought to be read thus. "And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, in or
through

Messiam quem misisti, quasi Grecé dictum esset hori ei ho monos alethinos theos, kai hon apesteilas Jesous ho Christos. Jesus autem hic ait hanc esse vitam eternam, non quód tota fides christiana, quanta quanta est, intra hæc duo capita in se spectata coercetur; sed quia hæc duo sunt veluti cæterorum omnium fundamentum, credere illum esse solum verum Deum, qui est pater Jesu Christi, et Jesum esse Messiam, quem missurus erat. Absque

through his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life." That is to say, that we are brought to the knowledge of the true God, or have an understanding given us to know him, by the instrumentality of his Son Jesus Christ, who is the way, the truth, and the life, without whom none can come to the Father. Very properly then does the venerable Apostle add. This is the true God and eternal life. Little children keep yourselves from idols. This God, into the knowledge of whom ye are introduced by Jesus Christ, is the true God; and eternal life is the reward of that knowledge. Be careful therefore little children of debasing this pure religion, for every deviation from the worship of this true God by his Son Jesus Christ, is Idolatry. This passage therefore is so far from weakening the force of the words only true God, applied to the Father in our text, that it corroborates them, and throws additional light upon them.

But we have not yet done with the Trinitarians, they return to the charge in another way. The Father say they, may be here called the only true God in contradistinction to the Son; because he is the Fons Deitatis the fountain of divinity, the first person in order who is of none neither begotten nor proceeding; but this when granted, will not hinder our Lord Jesus Christ from being in the words of the Nicene creed, Deus ex Deo God of God, or God by communication of the Father's divinity. We reply, that this is a very important concession, and establishes one very clear prerogative of the Father above the Son, viz. That the Father is alone

sque hisce non constat Christianismus, cujus cetera dogmata sunt hisce superstructa: atque hisce admissis ut veris, cetera etiam admittat necesse est, vitamque ex iis instituat quisquis non insaniet, quisquis sibi constare velit, ut facie omnes intelligant—hina ginokosi &c.
The words must be rendered thus, that they may know thee who ART the only true God, and Jesus who is the Christ that thou hast sent; for the article *rex* must be repeated

alone, AUTO THEOS, or God of himself, that the Son owes every thing to the Father, and the Father nothing to the Son; and if this were consistently adhered to, and followed out, it would go a great way to reconcile parties as to the main point in controversy. For it would infallibly prove, that the Son was a being produced by the power and will of the Father; and consequently, that he could be considered in no other view than as a dependent being; or in other words a Creature. But this is far from the meaning of the Trinitarians: for they affirm, that in the Trinity none is before or after another, none is greater or less than another, but that the Glory is equal the Majesty co-eternal; and that there are three persons in the Godhead, of the same substance, power, and eternity, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost.

This preeminence therefore, that the consubstantial Trinitarians ascribe to the Father, of being the fountain of divinity or the first person in order; is but an empty title that amounts to nothing: and by no means comes up to the force and emphasis of the words of our text. Had the words run only thus---This is life eternal that they might know thee the Father who art God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent; it would have been enough in a fair and candid construction, to have determined the Godhead solely to the Father; but when to this is added, that the Father is true God, and only true God, the expression is so strong and peremptory, as to render all the attempts of sophistry to set it aside or explain it away absolutely vain and fruitless.

Leaving repeated before the word Christ. It is as if the meaning was expressed by the infinitive mood in the following manner; that they may know thee to be the only true God, and Jesus to be the Messiah whom thou hast sent, as if it had been said in Greek *hoti ei&c.* Christ here says that this is eternal life, not because the whole christian faith in its greatest extent, is comprehended under these two heads considered in themselves; but because these

Leaving then these gentlemen for a little, we shall fall to the consideration of our text; but before we do this it may be proper to remark its connection with the two verses immediately preceeding. St John's Gospel, xvii. 1. 2. and 3. "These words spake Jesus, and lifted up his eyes to heaven, and said, Father the hour is come, glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee; as thou hast given him power over all flesh; that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. These verses may be paraphrased in the following manner."

"Benevolent parent, the time of my last severe tryal
 "and death is now approaching, when I shall need thine
 "all-powerful aid. Continue to me, thy favoured child,
 "the gracious and extraordinary protection and support,
 "which I have hitherto so abundantly experienced, by
 "raising me speedily to life again, and making me the
 "happy means of bringing penitent and virtuous men
 "to eternal life. It is only by the true knowledge and
 "worship of thee, and a sincere obedience to thy will,
 "as taught by me, thy great prophet and messenger to
 "man, that this eternal life is to be attained."†

But however clearly this passage may be in our favour, we do not propose to rest our cause solely upon it, but shall only make use of it as the ground-work or basis of our reasoning; and shall therefore in support of the doctrine of our text, make an appeal to the scriptures at large, and endeavour to enforce and establish the following propositions.

First,
 two things are, as it were, the foundations of all the rest, to believe him who is the Father of Jesus Christ, to be the only true God, and Jesus to be the Messiah whom he purposed to send. Without these Christianity cannot stand, because all the rest of the truths asserted in it are built upon these; and these being admitted as true, the rest must also be admitted, and the life regulated by them, unless one will act a foolish and inconsistent part, as every body may easily perceive. *Le Clerc in loco.*

† *Lindsey's Sequel to his Apology, p; 249.*

First, that there is one person, or intelligent agent; who alone is God, supreme, almighty, and eternal: and that this one person is the Father, or as he is sometimes called in scripture, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. This is life eternal, that they might know THEE the only true God.

Secondly, that Jesus Christ is not the most high God; but a being inferior to him, dependant upon him, and acting by his command and authority: or in other words his Son, Servant, and Messenger; and by the Father's appointment, the Messiah, or only Mediator between God and Man, that they might know Jesus Christ whom THOU hast sent.

And Thirdly, and Lastly, we shall consider and answer the objections, that the Trinitarians make to our hypothesis, and urge in support of their own, founded on various places both of the Old and New Testament.

We shall be led to consider some of their objections occasionally in the progress of our argumentation; but it is our intention to reserve the greatest part of them to the sequel. We return then to our first proposition which is,

That there is one person, or intelligent agent who alone is God, supreme, almighty, and eternal: and that this one person is the Father, or as he is sometimes called in scripture, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God. For the sake of greater order and distinctness, we shall arrange the passages of scripture by which this first proposition is supported, into three classes.

First, we shall consider those which assert the unity of God. or God's being one person, without limiting this unity to any particular subject.

Secondly, those which absolutely restrict, and appropriate this unity, or one Godhead, to the Father, and to him only.

Thirdly, those which ascribe such high titles and sublime epithets to the Father; as render it impossible to suppose

suppose that any being in heaven or in earth, can be equal to him, or compared with him.

The first division then of our first proposition is, to consider those passages of scripture, which assert the unity of God, or God's being one person, without limiting this unity to any particular subject. Some of the most remarkable of these passages are the following.

Deut. vi. 4. "Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord." Math. xix. 16 and 17. "And behold, one came and said unto him, good master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, why callest thou me good? There is none good but one that is God." Mark xii. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. and 34. "One of the scribes asked him which is the first command of all? And Jesus answered him, the first of all the commandments is, hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord, and thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. This is the first commandment, and the second is like, namely this, thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself: there is none other commandment greater than these. And the scribe said unto him, well master, thou hast said the truth, for there is one God, and there is none other but HE: † and to love HIM with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbour as himself, is more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices. And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him, thou art not far from the kingdom of God." Rom. iii. 29. 30. "Is he the God of the Jews only? Is he not also of the Gentiles? Seeing it is one God which shall justify the
circumcision

† In Mark xii. 32. The greatest part of the ancient Mss want the word Theos, God. If we follow them we must read as follows. "Of a truth master, thou hast well said (cui) that he (the Lord Jehovah, mentioned verse 29) is one, and that there is none other but he" See Milne, Kuster, and Weistien. Dr. Clark, and Mr Lindsey also take notice of this.

circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith." 1 Cor. viii. 4. "There is none other God but one." 1 Tim. ii. 5. "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus" James ii. 19. "Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: the Devils also believe, and tremble"

To these places may be added, all those passages of scripture where God speaks himself, by the singular personal pronouns, I, and ME, or is addressed, or spoken of by others, with the pronouns, THOU, HE, HIM, which are also singular: as the following, Exod. xx. ii. "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, and out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other Gods before, or besides ME." Gen. xvii. 1. "The Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect." Isaiah xlv. 6. "Thus saith the Lord the King of Israel, and his Redeemer the Lord of hosts, I am the first, and I am the last, and besides me there is no God" Isaiah xlv. 8. "Is there a God besides me? Yea there is no God, I know not any." Psal. lxxv. iii. "O thou that hearest prayer, unto thee shall all flesh come." Psal. lxxxiii. 18. "Thou whose name alone is Jehovah, art the most high over all the earth." Or as some render this passage. "Thou whose name is Jehovah, who alone art the most high over all the earth." It would be easy to accumulate a vast number of passages of the like nature, but what we have already quoted are sufficient for our purpose.

Sure I am, that no body whose understanding had not been perverted by a theological system; and the imbibing false ideas from human creeds and confessions of faith, would ever imagine from the perusal of these, and similar passages in sacred scripture; that the supreme being was any more than one person. But say our opponents, the word used for God in the Hebrew, has a plural termination, although construed with a verb in the singular; and is Elohim, or Alcim, and from thence they would infer that there are a plurality of persons in

the Godhead: the plural termination denoting this plurality of persons, and the verb singular in construction referring to the unity of essence. To give an instance of this When it is said in Genesis, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth" - in the Hebrew it is literally, "Gods he created the heavens and the earth." We reply, that in all languages there are words of a plural termination that have a singular signification; and that this is an idiom or peculiarity of the Hebrew language, and is acknowledged to be so by some of the best Trinitarian critics themselves: that the singular verb in construction does not refer to any fanciful unity of different persons in the same essence: but clearly proves on the contrary, that the word Elohim, or Aleim, although of a plural termination, has a singular sense and meaning. As a proof of this, in the Septuagint, Vulgate, and other ancient versions of the Old Testament; as well as in our own, and the other modern ones, the word Elohim is always translated in the singular; and our Lord Jesus Christ and his Apostles when they quote passages from the Old Testament, observe the very same rule. This last consideration without adducing any more arguments, appears to me abundantly sufficient to ascertain the singular signification of the word Elohim. Many ingenious conjectures are offered by learned men, to account for this irregularity in the Hebrew language; but as they are more curious than useful we shall wave them at present.

But it is farther alledged by the Trinitarians, that God makes use of plural pronouns in speaking of himself, Gen. i. 26, "And God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness." Gen. iii. 22. "And the Lord God said behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil." Gen. xi. 7. "Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech." Isaiah vii. 8. "Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, whom shall I send and who will go for us" In regard to these passages, they are too few in number to counterbalance the many thousands on the opposite side,

side, where either God speaks himself or is addressed and spoken of by others, with the personal pronouns, I, THOU, ME, HIM: and it shews great want of candour and judgement in the Trinitarians, to catch at a shadow that seems to make for their party; and to pay no regard to a thousand times the weight of evidence on the opposite side. And this is a good general answer, though we were capable of saying nothing more. But to come to particulars. It is no uncommon thing in any language, ancient or modern, for single persons to speak in the plural; but it was never yet heard of in any age of the world, that more persons than one spoke in the singular. As to the passage, "let us make man in our image, after our likeness," about which the Trinitarians make so great a bustle: it is certain that the effect of God's purpose is described in the singular, in the verse immediately following, Gen. i. 27. "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him: male and female created he them." Our Saviour himself observes, Mark x. 6. "That from the beginning of the creation, God made them male and female." This is still more strongly expressed by Mat. Chap. xix. 4. "And he answered and said unto them, have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning, made them male and female." This clearly obviates any pretence of inferring a plurality of persons in the divine nature, from the expression, "let us make man:" And perhaps to represent the dignity of human nature, which was made after the image of God, the deity may be represented as consulting with himself when he undertook the creation of man; or perhaps declaring his purpose to the Angels as spectators of this memorable event: for we are told in Job, that at the creation, "the morning stars sung together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." This passage therefore being explained, there remains no difficulty in the rest, which may be accounted for in a similar manner.

Having removed these objections, we return to the consideration of the texts quoted before. And they are

so plain and express, that they are rather darkened than enlightened by many words. If God is more than one person, the sacred scriptures are one continued grammatical impropriety almost from beginning to end; which would be strange and ridiculous, if not impious to suppose. When God speaks to men, he must always be understood to speak after the manner of men; and as no instance can be produced amongst men of several persons speaking in the singular, every time that any of these personal pronouns are used concerning God, it is a demonstrative proof that he is one person. Besides, it is an absurdity in itself, and a gross perversion of language to affirm, that one God can ever mean more than one person. A man might as well say, that one man meant several men, one angel several angels, as assert that one God includes several divine persons. For what is a divine person, but (as has been frequently observed by Unitarian writers) a periphrasis, or circumlocution, or in plain English a round about way of speaking, to denote one God. If then one divine person be one God, it follows with invincible evidence and force of argument, that three such divine persons are three Gods. Our adversaries themselves will allow, that to say three persons are one person; three beings are one being; or three Gods are one God is a contradiction. If this is the case, it must also be a contradiction to affirm, that three divine persons are one God: for this (as before observed) is only saying the same thing in other words. Again, it is allowed by the ablest of our opponents, to be a demonstrative argument for the existence of one God, or one infinite mind or spirit in opposition to Polytheism; that one such God or Spirit possessed of every possible perfection, is sufficient for the creation and preservation of all things and that to suppose MORE is entirely unnecessary. It is absolutely necessary to suppose one self-existent being, to account for the Phenomena of nature; but it is by no means so to imagine MORE. It is an absurdity. For unity is certainly included in the idea of self-existence and infinity, and it we were to imagine

agine infinity to reside in more subjects than one, none of these supposed subjects would be infinite: and the unity and absolute supremacy of the Godhead would be destroyed. Apply this reasoning to the subject in hand, and it will be found equally strong to prove that God is one person, as that there is one God. For the words God, Person, and Being, when applied to one infinite intelligent agent, must ever be understood as convertible terms; and cannot be distinguished even in idea, altho' Schoolmen, Metaphysicians, and Trinitarian divines have attempted to do it, and have invented childish unmeaning, and irrational distinctions to darken the argument; and hinder the truth from being distinctly perceived.

The doctrine of the proper and personal unity of the supreme being, is a doctrine of the last importance in religion, never to be given up or departed from, on any pretence whatever. Under the old Jewish dispensation, God called upon his people to hear, to listen with the utmost attention, to this important truth Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord; or as some critics translate it, hear O Israel Jehovah our God Jehovah is one: † and under the Gospel dispensation, our Lord Jesus Christ and his Apostles, are still sounding the same awful truth in our ears. Moses and the Prophets, Jesus and his Apostles, were strangers to the doctrine of three consubstantial

† Learned men have translated Deut. Chap. vi. 4. very differently. Le Clerc renders it, Jehovah is our God, Jehovah only. Others, Jehovah our God, Jehovah is one. Dr. Waterland contends that it should be. The Lord our God is the sole Lord, or the only God. Any of these interpretations will do with the Unitarians. The two first suppose the word Jehovah to be a proper name. Mr. Madan has the following ridiculous interpretation "Jehovah (subsisting in) our Aleim (or plurality of persons) (is but) one Jehovah." That is to say, there are three Jehovah's, and yet there is but one Jehovah. The contradiction of this interpretation is evident.

consubstantial persons, or intelligent agents forming one supreme Godhead. This doctrine, as will more fully appear in the sequel, is not to be found in the scriptures; it has nothing better to support it than the authority of man.

We should now proceed to the second division of our first proposition, which was to consider those passages of scripture, which absolutely restrict and appropriate this unity or one Godhead to the Father; but this requiring to be treated at considerable length, cannot be entered upon at present. Now to the King, eternal, immortal, and invisible, the only wise, and only true God, be glory in the church, by Christ Jesus, AMEN.

DISCOURSES ON THE DIVINE UNITY.

DISCOURSE II.

John Chap. xvii. ver. 3. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

THE last time we met together in this place, we entered upon the consideration of these words. We observed, that they contained a very important speculative truth, viz. That the knowledge of God and Christ, or the different characters and relations which they stand in to us, is necessary to the obtaining of eternal life. We observed farther, that it is obvious to every one's consideration who takes the words of our text in their just and natural sense, that the Father is here styled and that by our Lord himself, the only true God: and Jesus Christ is distinguished from him under the character of one that he hath sent, or as his messenger, legate, or ambassador. We remarked, that this our text has ever been held deservedly dear by those who maintain the proper unity of God, and that he is the Father only: and that on the other hand, those who oppose this important truth, and affirm that there are a plurality of co-equal and consubstantial persons in the Godhead, have endeavoured to explain away its natural and genuine meaning, and put a forced and arbitrary construction upon it. We examined and obviated the objections of the Trinitarians to our interpretation; and shewed that these words only true God; addressed by our Lord to the Father, are so strong and peremptory, as to render all the attempts of sophistry to set them aside or explain them away absolutely vain and fruitless. But we remarked,

ed, that however clearly this passage might be in our favour, we did not intend to rest our cause solely upon it, but should only make use of it as the ground-work and basis of our reasoning; and should therefore in support of the doctrine of our text, make an appeal to the scriptures at large, and endeavour to enforce and establish the following propositions.

First, that there is one person, or intelligent agent, who alone is God, supreme, almighty, and eternal: and that this one person is the Father, or as he is sometimes called in scripture, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God.

Secondly, that Jesus Christ is not the most high God; but a being inferior to him, dependent upon him, and acting by his command and authority: or in other words his Son, Servant, and Messenger: and by the Father's appointment the Messiah, or only mediator between God and man. That they might know Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent,

And Thirdly and Lastly, to consider and answer the objections, that the Trinitarians make to our hypothesis, and urge in support of their own, founded on various places both of the Old and New Testament.

For the sake of greater order and distinctness, we proposed to arrange the passages of scripture by which our first proposition is supported into three classes, viz,

First, to consider those which assert the unity of God, or Gods being one person, without limiting this unity to any particular subject.

Secondly, those which absolutely restrict, and appropriate this unity, or one Godhead, to the Father, and to him only.

Thirdly, those which ascribe such high titles and sublime epithets to the Father: as render it impossible to suppose that any being in Heaven or in Earth, can be equal to him, or compared with him.

The first of these subdivisions, we considered and discussed

cussed in the preceding discourse: and quoted many expressions of scripture to prove the unity of God, or that there is but one God. We shewed that the proper and natural signification of one God, is one person, one infinite mind or intelligent agent; and that this is also demonstratively proved by God's making use of the singular pronouns, I, and ME, in speaking to man; and by being addressed and spoken of by others, with the pronouns, THOU and HE which are also singular. We replied to objections founded upon the plural termination of the word Elohim or Aleim in the Hebrew language; and also upon God's speaking in the plural in a few passages of the Old Testament. What we have now before us, is the second and third divisions of our first proposition which as they are closely connected and tend mutually to throw light upon one another, we shall put into one. Our subject to day therefore is, to consider those passages of scripture, which ascribe such high titles and sublime epithets to the Father, and so absolutely restrict the unity or one Godhead to him; as render it impossible to suppose that any being in heaven or in earth, can be equal to him, or compared with him.

John Chap. vi. 45. 46. "It is written in the Prophets, and they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me. Not that any man hath seen the Father, save he which is of God, he hath seen the Father." John viii. 54. "Jesus answered, if I honour myself, my honour is nothing; it is my Father that honoureth me; of whom ye say, that he is your God." John xii. 3. "Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God, and went to God." John xiv. 1. 2. "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions, &c." John xvi. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. "At that day ye shall ask in my name: and I say not unto you, that I will pray the Father for you. For the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God. I came forth from the Father,

and am come into the world : again, I leave the world, and go to the Father. His disciples said unto him, lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no proverb: Now we are sure that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask thee : by this we believe that thou camest forth from God." John xx, 17 " Go to my brethren and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, to my God and your God." 1 Thes. iii. 11. " Now God himself and our Father and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you." Rom. i. 7. " Grace to you, and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ " 1 Cor. i. 1. 2. 3. 4. " Paul called to be an Apostle of Jesus Christ, through the will of God, and Sosthenes our brother; unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be Saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours. Grace be unto you, and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ. I thank my God always on your behalf, for the grace of God which is given you by Jesus Christ:" 2 Cor. i. 1. 2. 3. 4. " Paul an Apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, and Timothy our brother, unto the church of God which is at Corinth, with all the saints which are in all Achaia. Grace be to you, and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ. Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and the God of all comfort; who comforteth us in all our tribulation, that we may be able to comfort them which are in any trouble, by the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God." Gal. i. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. " Paul an Apostle (not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father who raised him from the dead) and all the brethren which are with me, unto the churches of Galatia. Grace be unto you, and peace from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ; who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father, to whom be glory for ever and ever, Amen."

Amen." Eph. i. 1. 2. 3. "Paul an Apostle of Jesus Christ, by the will of God, to the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus. Grace be to you, and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ. Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ, &c." 1 Peter i. 1. 2. 3. "Peter an Apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia, elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience, and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ; Grace unto you, and peace be multiplied. Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, &c."

In like manner one may peruse all the introductory addresses in the other Epistles, where the style will be always found uniform and similar to this; or at least not contradictory to it. The most superficial reader cannot but observe a striking difference, betwixt the style of the inspired writers, and that of modern Trinitarians; God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost is their language: but God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ, is the language of the venerable Apostles. There is not such an expression, as God the Son, or God the Holy Ghost, to be found in all the New Testament. Had the inspired Apostles known that our Lord Jesus Christ was God equal with the Father, they would undoubtedly have called him so: and if the Holy Ghost had been a distinct person equal with God the Father, a very different language would have been held concerning him also. But these are improvements in divinity for which we are indebted to the ingenuity of later times. Should it be asked, if Jesus Christ is not God equal with the Father, why is he joined with him in the beginning of the Epistles: and grace, mercy, and peace, wished from him as well as the Father? The answer is
short

short and plain. Jesus Christ after his resurrection from the dead was made Lord and Christ by the Father, as we are informed in the Acts of the Apostles: and was constituted head over all things to his church; and as Mediator between God and Man he is the great medium by which all Gospel blessings descend to us, and is therefore properly coupled with the Father, in all the apostolical benedictions and salutations. The passages we have already quoted, to which a great number might be added, are sufficiently plain and clear to prove our point; but we shall produce others still more express and decisive. Luke x. 21. "In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit; and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of Heaven and Earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes: even so, Father; for so it seemeth good in thy sight." Here the Father, is characterised as the Lord or absolute master of heaven and earth; or of the whole creation. It is saying in other words, that he is dependent upon none, and accountable to none for his conduct; that he does what he wills in the armies of heaven, and amongst the inhabitants of this lower world, that none can stay his omnipotent hand from working, neither dare any say unto him what dost thou? And our Lord Jesus acquiesces with pleasure and satisfaction in his providential dispensations; and thanks him for having hid the great truths of the Gospel, from haughty, selfish, and worldly minded men, (here called the wise and prudent) who will not receive the truth in the love thereof; and for having revealed or made known these salutary truths, to men of opposite characters and tempers, compared for their mildness and docility to babes. John iv. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. "The woman saith unto him, sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet. Our Fathers worshipped in this mountain; and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem worship the Father. Ye worship ye know not

not what : we know what we worship : for salvation is of the Jews. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth : for the Father seeketh such to worship him, God is a spirit ; and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth. In this passage our Saviour points out to us, the great object of religious worship and adoration. It was the Father only that the devout Jews worshipped. They had no conception of any other divine agent or person ; but him alone. There existed a dispute betwixt the Jews and Samaritans, concerning the mode or manner of worship. The former asserted that Jerusalem was the place where men ought to worship ; and where the religious festivals ought to be held : and the latter contended, that Mount Gerizim was the proper place for celebrating the ordinances of religion. Our Saviour decides the controversy clearly in favour of his countrymen the Jews ; and tells the woman that the Samaritans worshipped they knew not what. But at the same time lets her know for her comfort, that this advantage which the Jews possessed over the Samaritans, was not at that period of time a matter of great consequence ; for says he " the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father, in spirit and in truth : for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a spirit, and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth." From this place of scripture a very considerable argument may be formed in favour of the Unitarians. For it proves that the Father, and the Father only (as before taken notice of) was the object of worship under the Jewish dispensation ; and that he is still the object whom the true worshippers shall worship, under the new or Gospel dispensation. Had there been a Son or Holy Spirit, equal with the Father, and entitled to equal honour and glory with him, undoubtedly our Lord would not have failed to have communicated, this important piece of information to the woman of Samaria. But it is here made the characteristic of the true worshippers,

shippers, that they worship the Father in spirit and in truth. What kind of worshippers must we then suppose those to be, who set up two other objects of supreme worship besides the Father?

That the Father is the great object of religious worship and adoration, and consequently alone possessed of supreme Godhead, is farther demonstrated, from the practice of Christ: who always prayed to the Father when on earth, and commanded his disciples to do so likewise. We never read of our Lord Jesus praying to the Holy Ghost; or ascribing glory to him. But he tells us expressly, Math. vi. 6 "But thou when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly," And again verse ix. "After this manner pray ye: Our Father who art in heaven" &c. It is true, our Lord afterwards was pleased to give us farther directions concerning prayer; by commanding us to pray in his name; and the Apostle Paul desires us, that "whatever we do, to do all in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, giving thanks unto God and the Father by him". But praying in the name of Christ, is very different from praying to Christ as God, equal with the Father: a method of worship which the Christian religion, if we take our ideas of it from the scriptures, knows nothing of.

But we proceed Eph. iii. 14. and 21. "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might, by his spirit in the inner man: that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints, what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God. Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh

worketh in us, unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus, throughout all ages, world without end. Amen." This sublime passage discovers to us the incomparable power and excellence, of the God and Father of all: to whom the Apostle bows his knee in profound adoration; and of whom he declares the whole family in heaven and earth is named. He represents him as one, who is able to do exceeding abundantly forth, above all that we can ask or think, and therefore ascribes glory to him in the church by Christ Jesus, world without end, Amen. 1 Cor. viii. 4. 5. 6: "There is none other God but one. For though there be, that are called Gods, whither in heaven or in earth, (as there be Gods many, and Lords many,) but to us there is but one God, THE FATHER, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things and we by him." This passage is altogether decisive, peremptory, and express, in favour of the Unitarian doctrine. The Apostles, meaning is expressed with all the force and clearness of a proposition: and is so guarded as to leave no room for subterfuge, and evasion. 1st. St. Paul affirms that there is no other God but one. Then he adds next to make his meaning still more evident; "For though there be, that are called Gods, whither in heaven or in earth, (as there be Gods many, and Lords many.)" This clause a learned author who wrote upwards of a century ago, considers as relating to the state of the heathen world, his words are as follows. "Though there be
 " Gods many, (that is many celestial and sovereign
 " deities: and Lords many, (that is many Baalims,
 " Lords agents and presidents of earthly things.) yet to
 " us christians there is but one sovereign God, the Father,
 " of whom are all things, and we in him as it is in
 " the Greek, to him, (that is, to whom as supreme we
 " are to direct all our services;) and but one Lord Jesus
 " Christ, one Lord agent (instead of their many Baal-
 " lims and Dæmon mediators) by whom are all things
 " which come from the Father to us, and through whom
 " alone we find access unto him. The allusion methinks is
 " passing

“ passing elegant, and such as I think cannot be well understood without this distinction of superior and inferior deities in the divinity of the Gentiles; they having a plurality in both sorts, and we but one in each as our Apostle affirmeth.” So far this ingenious writer. † Perhaps also, the Apostle may allude to all those that are called Gods in scripture in the inferior sense; such as Angels, Kings, and Magistrates &c. But to proceed. The Apostle having mentioned, these Gods many and Lords many, in heaven and in earth, and set them all aside, comes now to inform us who that supreme and sovereign God is, whom as christians we are bound to worship and adore. “ To us (says he) there is but one God, THE FATHER, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ by or through whom are all things and we by him.” Here, the ONE GOD, and the ONE LORD are so clearly and accurately distinguished from, and contrasted with, one another, that it is impossible to confound them without the grossest abuse, and perversion of language. Here also it is obvious to remark again, how different the language of the Apostle Paul is, from that of certain articles, and confessions of faith. “ In the unity of the Godhead, (saith the first article of a certain church) there be three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost;” And the sixth answer of a certain Catechism well known in this country affirms that, “ There are three persons in the Godhead the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost and these three are one God the same in substance, equal in power, and in glory.” How far these assertions can be reconciled to the doctrine of the Apostle Paul, let every candid and sensible person judge. It is strange however, that if people will make creeds, articles, and confessions of faith, they should make them in direct contradiction to the scriptures.

The same Apostle informs us particularly Phil. ii. 9: 10. 11. why the title of LORD was conferred upon Jesus Christ. “ Wherefore, (says he) on the account of his humbling

humbling himself, and becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the cross;) God hath also highly exalted him, and given him a name that is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth: and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Observe attentively, that when we acknowledge Jesus Christ as Lord, we are to do it to the glory of God the Father: who exalted him to this state of dominion and dignity. For, he that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father who hath sent him: and vice versa or contrary-wise, it may be inferred that he that honoureth the Son, honoureth the Father who hath sent him. For, the honour given to an Ambassador, or Viceroy, reflects back upon, and is kindly received by the Monarch who employs him; and in whose name he acts. But in order to ascertain still more clearly the reasons, for which the title of Lord, or the one Lord, is given to Jesus Christ; we shall recite at large that passage of the Acts of the Apostles, to which we before referred; and which will be found abundantly satisfactory for the purpose, Acts ii. 22. to 36 inclusive. "Ye men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know. Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain: whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death; because it was not possible that he should be holden of it. For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face, for he is on my right-hand, that I should not be moved. Therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad: moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope. Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption. Thou hast made known to me the ways of life; thou shalt make me full of joy with thy
D countenance

countenance. Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ, to sit on his throne; he, seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we are all witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear. For David is not ascended unto the heavens: but he saith himself, the Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool. Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified, both LORD and CHRIST."

From this quotation it evidently appears, that Jesus Christ possesses the title of LORD only in consequence of the Father's donation; and as a reward for his distinguished merit and obedience. It is by the right hand of God that he is exalted; and it is from the Father that he receives the promise of the Holy Ghost. It is by the Father's power, and not his own, that he reigns, and shall reign until he hath put all his enemies under his feet. However therefore, the Trinitarians may ridicule the notion of a MADE LORD, such a Lord is our Lord Jesus Christ: and the ridicule must fall on the scriptures, and not on the Unitarians. To the one God, and Father of all, of whom are all things, be glory by the one Lord, Jesus Christ, for ever, AMEN.

DISCOURSES ON THE DIVINE UNITY.

DISCOURSE III.

John Chap. xvii. ver. 3. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

WE have had these words twice under our consideration before. In our first discourse, after making some observations on the natural and obvious meaning of the words; and replying to several objections to our interpretation of them, we proposed to make them the ground-work or basis of our reasoning: and by an appeal to the scriptures at large, to endeavour to enforce and establish the following propositions, viz

First, that there is one person, or intelligent agent, who alone is God, supreme, almighty, and eternal: and that this one person is the Father, or as he is sometimes called in scripture, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God.

Secondly, that Jesus Christ is not the most high God; but a being inferior to him, dependant upon him, and acting by his command and authority: or in other words his Son, Servant, and Messenger; and by the Father's appointment, the Messiah, or only Mediator between God and Man. That they might know Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

And Thirdly, and Last'y, to consider and answer the objections, that the Trinitarians make to our hypothesis, and urge in support of their own, founded on various places both of the Old and New Testament.

For

For the sake of greater order and distinctness, we proposed to arrange the passages of scripture by which our first proposition is supported, into three classes, viz.

First, those which assert the unity of God, or God's being one person, without limiting this unity to any particular subject:

Secondly, those which absolutely restrict, and appropriate this unity, or one Godhead, to the Father, and to him only.

Thirdly, those which ascribe such high titles and sublime epithets to the Father; as render it impossible to suppose that any being in heaven or in earth, can be equal to him, or compared with him.

The first of these divisions of our first proposition, we discussed in our first discourse on this subject: and as the second and third, have a great affinity to, and a close connection with one another, we proposed in our second discourse, to put them into one in the following manner, viz. To consider those passages of scripture, which ascribe such high titles and sublime epithets to the Father; or so absolutely restrict, and appropriate, this unity, or one Godhead to him, as render it impossible to suppose that any being in heaven or in earth, can be equal to him, or compared with him.

In proof of this proposition, we quoted in our second discourse a great many passages of the New Testament, all of them direct and apposite to our purpose. We insisted more particularly: upon the apostolical benedictions and salutations: upon our Lord's calling his Father Lord of heaven and earth, and acquiescing with entire submission in his providential dispensations: upon the discourse of our Lord with the woman of Samaria, and his informing her that the true worshippers should worship the Father, in spirit and in truth; and that the Father sought such to worship him: upon the practice of Christ who always prayed to the Father himself, and commanded his followers to do so also: upon that celebrated passage in, 1 Cor. viii. 4. 5. 6. “There is none

none other God but one. For though there be that are called Gods, whether in heaven, or in earth (as there be Go's many, and Lords many) But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him: and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." These passages we considered at large, and pointed out their genuine force and efficacy; and how strongly conclusive they were in favour of our doctrine.

We have yet some places of a like nature to examine and illustrate, Eph. i. 15, to the end. "Wherefore I also, after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus, and love unto all the saints, cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers; that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation, in the knowledge of him; the eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints. And what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power; which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places far above all principality, and power and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is ^{his} body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all." This passage is exceedingly sublime, and I have recited it at large that its connection may be the better understood. Here, we have the God and Father of all, characterised by the Apostle as the Father of glory; and the God of our Lord Jesus Christ: not only his Father, but his God; his superior on whom he depends: and from whom he receives all his power and glory. He is represented as the person, who by the operation of his boundless and irresistible power raised our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead

dead; and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places; and constituted him head over all things to his church. Hardly any thing stronger can be alledged, for the absolute supremacy and authority of the Father; and the entire subordination, and inferiority of our Lord Jesus Christ to him.

But we go on to take notice of another passage in the same Epistle, Eph. iv 4 5. 6. " There is one body, and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all. This passage is striking and emphatical to the last degree. First the Apostle affirms, there is one body and then one spirit by which that one body is animated: one hope, or glorious expectation of an heavenly inheritance fit before all christians: One Lord, by which he undoubtedly means our Lord Jesus Christ, whom God the Father hath made both Lord and Christ; and who is therefore ever to be acknowledged and revered as Lord, to the glory of God the Father: One faith or standard of belief and doctrine, which all christians who value the honour and purity of their religion, ought solemnly to profess, and steadily to adhere to: One baptism, or cleansing and washing with water, betokening a renunciation of all moral pollution and defilements and that purity of heart and life which christians ought ever to maintain and observe: and then to crown the whole he adds, one God, and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all. Or in other words, that there is one supreme intelligent agent, or person, called the Father, who is absolutely unequalled in power, dignity, and glory, and who supports, pervades, and fills, the whole system of universal nature. A description of God, equally devout, rational, and philosophical: but at the same time diametrically opposite to the notion, of three persons, or intelligent agents, forming one supreme Godhead. For if that system had any foundation in the nature of things, or in divine revelation, the Apostles description of the
one

one God would be very lame and defective, by leaving out two persons to whom the Godhead belonged as well as the Father. Neither could it be justly affirmed that the Father was above all, if there were two persons of the same substance, power, and eternity with him. In this case, the Apostle ought to have made use of very different language and undoubtedly would have done so, if there had been any truth in this opinion. I apprehend he would have expressed himself in this manner, or similar to it. There is one spirit, one Lord, and one Father, and these three are one God, and are above all, through all, and in you all. No Unitarian, were he to express his own belief, could choose better terms than our Apostle has done to, his hand, and already supplied him with; and on the other hand, there is no Trinitarian were he to give a definition of his faith; but would use terms and expressions quite different from those of the Apostle. This clearly discovers, that the opinions of the former, viz the Unitarians, are perfectly harmonious with, and correspondent to those of this eminent teacher of pure and undefiled religion; and that the notions of the latter, viz the Trinitarians, are altogether inconsistent with his meaning, and ideas. For my part, I look upon this short summary of christian doctrine which St. Paul has here exhibited, to be one of the best creeds, and confessions of Faith, that I ever perused in my life, and far superior to many of those, which human folly and presumption has substituted in its room. In vain do the Trinitarians attempt by sophistical arts, to explain away the natural and obvious sense of this place of sacred scripture; and to mould and shape the Apostles words into a consistency, with their own absurd and metaphysical schemes. The Apostle by first mentioning the one spirit, and the one Lord, and inserting other things between, has absolutely prevented this perversion of his meaning. As well may they affirm that the one body, one hope one faith, and one baptism, are persons in the Godhead, (and then we shall have seven persons instead of three) as affirm, that the one spirit, or one Lord, are so. The one spirit, and

one Lord, are clearly distinguished and discriminated from the one God and Father of all, who is above all and therefore as before observed, can have no equal or associate in the government of the world.

There are a vast number of passages of scripture, in which though the word God occurs without the paternal character being annexed to it; yet it is absolutely necessary to understand them of God the Father, such as the following, Rom. xvi. 27. "To God only wise be glory through Christ Jesus &c." 1 Tim ii. 5. "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus." Luke i. 32. "The Lord God shall give unto him (viz Christ) the throne, of his Father David." Luke, ii. 52. "And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and Man." John iii. 16. "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son &c." John iii, 34. "He whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the spirit by measure unto him." Acts iv. 24 to 30. "And when they heard that, they lift up their voice with one accord, and said, Lord, thou art God, which hast made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is: &c." Acts x, 38. "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the holy ghost and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him." Acts, xvii. 30. 31. "God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained: whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." Rom. ii. 16. "In that day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my Gospel." Rom. vi. 23. The gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord. 1 Cor. xii. 4. 5. 6. "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all."

In all these, and many other passages of scripture, although

though the word Father be not expressed, it is most certainly implied. For, the words God, and Father, in the New Testament (excepting in a few passages wherein the word God, may be used in an inferior acceptation) are ever convertible terms. Nor can the Trinitarians produce a single instance, wherein the word God signifies more persons than one. From this consideration it is apparent and obvious, that the doctrine of a co equal and consubstantial Trinity in unity, has no foundation in the New Testament. If the inspired writers had intended to have inculcated such a doctrine upon us, they would have made use of clear and positive expressions, sufficient to have ascertained their meaning to the lowest capacity.

But so far are the Evangelists and Apostles from teaching such a doctrine, that neither the words Trinity in unity, nor any term equivalent to them, occur in the whole compass of their writings: but on the contrary, they have by many plain and decisive expressions, confined the one Gohead solely to the person of the Father; and thereby excluded every other being whatever from being partaker of it. A very sensible writer who has distinguished himself in this controversy; and supported the Unitarian cause with great ability, observes. † “ That
 “ upon a strict enquiry it appears, that the word, God,
 “ occurs in the sacred books of the New Testament,
 “ twelve hundred and eighty eight times; that there
 “ are several hundred texts, wherein the Father is styled
 “ God absolutely, by way of eminence, it being impos-
 “ sible by the construction itself, that it should have
 “ any other sense. It is reasonable to understand the
 “ word, God, in the same sense in all the other texts,
 “ excepting those few, wherein the word is applied to
 “ Christ, and o her beings, in an inferior sense, expres-
 “ sly warranted by the sacred writers. There is not
 “ one text, wherein the word God, necessarily signifies
 “ more persons than one. There is not one text,
 “ wherein

† The author of the appeal to the common sense of all christian people. E

“ wherein we are obliged to understand it of three persons, the sacred writers have not afforded us the least plausible pretence, or colour, for say such sense.” So far this writer.

I have now my christian brethren, in this, and the two preceding discourses, produced all the passages of scripture that I intend to alledge in proof of my first proposition, which was: That there is one person, or intelligent agent, who alone is God, supreme, almighty, and eternal, and that this one person is the Father, or as he is sometimes called in scripture, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. “ This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God.” I have selected the most pertinent and decisive texts; and could easily have increased their number had it been necessary. Some passages I have purposely omitted, because they come more naturally to be considered under the second proposition, than the first. I shall employ the remainder of this discourse, in pursuing more fully the hints I started in the first, concerning the repugnancy of this doctrine of a Trinity in unity to the light of natural reason. We have already seen that it is contradicted by divine revelation; the great standard of our belief in religious matters.

Reason points out to us the necessity of believing, in a first cause, or original of all things. We are sure that we did not make ourselves: nor the world wherein we live. We are sure, that neither the world nor ourselves were made by chance, which properly speaking is nothing but a name, that conveys no idea to the mind. We also may be very certain that the world wherein we live and its inhabitants, are not eternal; because experience and the history of mankind confutes this absurd supposition; and the sacred volume assures us, that in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. We find ourselves obliged to suppose a first cause, a cause uncaused by any foreign or external cause, who exists by absolute necessity of nature, who has been from eternity

nity; and who gave life and existence to all other beings whatever.

But although one may be compelled by irresistible evidence, to acknowledge one first cause: yet no good argument can be produced to make it even probable, that more than one exists; or can exist. For one divine person or intelligent agent, possessed of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, is sufficient for all the purposes of creation, and preservation. This will appear still more clear and striking, by stating an absurd and impossible supposition. Let us suppose for instance, that there are a thousand divine persons, each of them perfect God, as the word divine when taken in a strict and absolute sense implies; and possessed of all the proper attributes of God. It is perfectly obvious, that any one of these persons, could perform as much singly, as the whole could do collectively. For each of them, if he be perfect God, must be omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, and infinitely wise, and good; or in other words must possess, all the natural and moral attributes of God. From this consideration it clearly and necessarily follows, that nine hundred and ninety nine of these supposed divine persons would be supernumerary and useless: for while one of them remains, that one, is equivalent to the whole; and is sufficient to account for the whole system of nature. Let us apply this mode of reasoning, to the commonly received doctrine of the Trinity. There are three persons, or intelligent agents, say the advocates for this doctrine, each of them God, and perfect God; or possessed of every possible perfection. I would ask the Gentlemen who maintain this opinion, what use two of these persons are for; or what purpose they serve in nature? Is not God the Father ALONE sufficient, to create, or bring into being the Universe, and to preserve and continue it in being when created? What reason then can be given for the existence, of a God the Son, or a God the Holy Ghost, equal with God the Father? It is evident, that these two persons are as much supernumerary and unnecessary, as the nine hundred and ninety

ninety nine above mentioned. It is absolutely necessary to stop, at one person strictly and properly divine. If we once go beyond simple Unity, there is no saying how far we may proceed. If we adventure to make a second, or third divine person, equal with the first; we may advance to a hundred, or a thousand such persons, until we renew the whole system of Pagan Polytheism. But say the Trinitarians, we do not affirm that the three divine persons are three Gods; we deny this conclusion, and positively maintain, that they are not three Gods, but one God. And this is a great ineffable mystery which is beyond the reach of human understanding to fathom or comprehend. To this we reply, that it is no mystery; but an express contradiction in terms to affirm, that three divine persons, or intelligent agents, are not three Gods, but one God. For the words divine person, in the strict sense, are nothing else (as we before remarked) but a round about way of expressing, the term God; and if one divine person be one God, it follows undeniably, that three divine persons are three Gods. For to say, that the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; and yet affirm, that these are not three Gods, but one God, is affirming and denying in the very same breath; and equivalent to the assertion, that a thing is, and is not at the same time. It may with equal propriety be affirmed, that God existed from all eternity; and yet began to exist at a certain period: that God exists throughout all nature; and yet is confined to a certain locality, or portion of space: that God is all-powerful; and yet is limited in his operations: or that God knows all things, and yet is ignorant of many things.—These are affirmations, that every man of sound understanding will admit to be contradictory and absurd; and the same good sense which discovers the inconsistency of these assertions, would if it were permitted to operate and exert itself, shew an equal contradiction, in the scheme of a consubstantial Trinity in unity. But (as an eminent writer observes) “ This distinction of persons
 “ in the Godhead, or divine essence, is also attended
 “ with

“ with other very great absurdities, as explained by
 “ Divines. For they are constrained to allow and main-
 “ tain that every person is distinguished from the other
 “ two by his own peculiar property; otherwise they
 “ would not be distinct or different persons, but one
 “ and the same person. Accordingly they tell us, that
 “ that every person in the divine nature or essence, is an
 “ intelligent substance, subsisting by itself, and really dis-
 “ tinguished from the other two, by its own incommuni-
 “ cable property. And if so, then it follows, that every
 “ person in the Godhead, or divine essence; has some
 “ property which the other two have not. For in-
 “ stance, the incommunicable and distinguishing pro-
 “ perty of the Father is *AGENNESIA*, or his being un-
 “ begotten: which property belongs neither to the Son,
 “ nor the spirit but to the Father alone; and being in-
 “ communicable can belong to none but him. The
 “ incommunicable and distinguishing property of the
 “ Son is *GENNESIS*, or being begotten, which proper-
 “ ty belongs neither to the Father, nor the spirit, but
 “ to the Son alone; and being incommunicable can be-
 “ long to none but him. The incommunicable and
 “ distinguishing property of the spirit is *EKPOREUSIS*,
 “ or his proceeding from the Father and the Son; which
 “ property belongs neither to the Father, nor the Son,
 “ but to the spirit alone; and being incommunicable can
 “ belong to none but him. Now, seeing every one of
 “ those persons is supposed to be, or subsist in the divine
 “ essence, it follows, that every one of these properties,
 “ which belongs to these persons, must also be in the
 “ divine essence. And certainly every property in the
 “ divine nature or essence, must be a perfection. For
 “ in a nature infinitely perfect, no property can possibly
 “ be a defect or imperfection. Whence it follows,
 “ that every one of the persons supposed to subsist in the
 “ Godhead, or divine essence, must have at least one per-
 “ fection which the other two want; and must want
 “ at least two perfections which the others have. Con-
 “ sequently, no one of the persons, upon this scheme

“ can be absolutely perfect, (because every one wants at
 “ least two perfections), and so, no one of the three per-
 “ sons can be the one true God, or the necessarily all-
 “ perfect being. If it be said that all the three persons
 “ together, make the one true God; then it is evident,
 “ that the essence of the one true God is compounded
 “ of perfections, and defects; seeing every person in the
 “ divine essence wants two perfections, which the others
 “ have, or hath one perfection which the others want.
 “ But this is absurd, and inconsistent with the all-per-
 “ fect nature of God, Nay, further, it will follow,
 “ that the essence of the one true God, must
 “ admit of contradictory and opposite properties or
 “ perfections. For one person in the Godhead, or divine
 “ essence, will be endowed with the property of
 “ being unbegotten, and another person with the con-
 “ trary and opposite property of being begotten. One
 “ person will proceed, and the other two will not pro-
 “ ceed. So that it will at the same time be true of the
 “ divine essence, that it is begotten and not begotten,
 “ that it proceeds and doth not proceed, which is ab-
 “ surd, and altogether inconsistent with the all perfect
 “ nature of God. Thus this scheme terminates in A-
 “ theism, or the denying of the one only Lord God,
 “ Jude Ver 4 ” † From these considerations it ap-
 pears, how dangerous it is to depart from the pre-
 cise and simple notion of unity, in speaking or rea-
 soning concerning the divine being. The Trinitarians
 are perpetually varying and shifting their Theories,
 and Hypotheses, and often to avoid one absurdity find
 themselves obliged to run into a greater. They have
 frequently invented new modes of explication and il-
 lustration: and the new when accurately examined,
 are found to be full as contradictory as the old. There
 is always some latent absurdity, discoverable by an acute
 and

† For this quotation I am indebted, to the late learn-
 ed and acute Dr Taylor, some-time Pastor to a society
 of protestant Dissenters at Norwich; and afterwards
 Professor of Divinity at the Academy of Warrington.

and intelligent examiner, which unawares oversets the whole laboured and intricate system, which had cost so much labour of thought, and consumption of time, to fabricate.

Some Trinitarians have affirmed, that their three divine persons, are three distinct minds and substances, which are one by a mutual consciousness, or a mutual in-existence. But neither mutual consciousness, nor mutual in-existence, will make three distinct minds and substances to be one God. For, if we could suppose three men to know one another's thoughts perfectly; yet while each man retained the faculty of thinking for himself; and could communicate his ideas to the other two, as well as receive theirs; all the three would be still separate and distinct beings; and could with no propriety be affirmed to be one being. The same reasoning will apply to the deity. And as to mutual in-being or in-existence, if this in-existence extends so far, as to blend, mingle, or confound the essences, or subsistencies, of the three supposed divine persons together, then, the distinction of persons will be entirely lost; and the mind will discern nothing but unity alone. Or on the other hand, if each person remains distinct and separate, notwithstanding this in-existence, and retains all his proper powers and attributes, they will still be different beings, and distinct agents. They may indeed be called three UNITED Gods: but can never truly be affirmed to be one God. Other Trinitarians reject this notion of three distinct minds and substances, and pronounce it heretical, and contend for a Trinity of modes, a Trinity of attributes, characters, respects, relations, attitudes, somewhats, &c. &c. But this is in effect to give up the Trinity, and has been justly called Sabellianism, or disguised Unitarianism. It is retaining the language of pretended Orthodoxy, and explaining away the spirit of it. I am almost ashamed to mention the strange similitudes and comparisons, to which some Trinitarians have descended, in endeavouring to illustrate their principles: They have compared their Trinity in unity, to a triangle, a cube, to
the

the three principal faculties of the human mind, understanding, memory, and will, and to many other things, too tedious and trivial to be recapitulated in this place. Some have asserted, that society was necessary to the felicity of the divine being, as if God could not be completely happy, without the company of other beings like himself. But what low ideas must these persons have, of the all-perfect and self sufficient Jehovah who is infinitely removed from all the weaknesses and imperfections to which human nature is subjected, and which render the mutual intercourse and society of friends, a principal ingredient in human happiness.

I have now finished all that I inted to say upon the first proposition. In my next discourse, I shall enter upon the consideration of the second, which was to prove from the scriptures, that Jesus Christ is not the most high God, but a being inferior to him, dependent upon him, and acting by his command and authority: or in other words his Son, Servant, and Messenger, and by the Father's appointment the Messiah, or only mediator between God and Man. In the mean time my brethren, let us devoutly reverence, and faithfully serve, this one living and true God, whose sole existence as such, is clearly demonstrable both from reason and scripture. Let us endeavour to live and act as seeing him who is invisible, and in the certain expectation of that awful and important day, when he shall judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given to all men assurance, in that he hath raised him from the dead. To this one God and Father of all, who is above all, through all, and in us all, be glory by Christ Jesus for ever, AMEN,

DISCOURSES ON THE DIVINE UNITY.

DISCOURSE IV.

John Chap. xvii. ver. 3. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

WHEN we entered upon the consideration of these words, we proposed to make them the groundwork and basis of our reasoning: and by an appeal to the scriptures at large, to endeavour to enforce and establish the following propositions,

First, that there is one person, or intelligent agent, who alone is God, supreme, almighty, and eternal: and that this one person is the Father, or as he is sometimes called in scripture, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God.

Secondly, that Jesus Christ is not the most high God; but a being inferior to him, dependent upon him, and acting by his command and authority: or in other words his Son, Servant and Messenger; and by the Father's appointment, the Messiah, or only Mediator between God and Man. That they might know Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

And Thirdly and Lastly, to consider and answer the objections, that the Trinitarians make to our hypothesis, and urge in support of their own, founded on various places both of the Old and New Testament.

The first of these propositions we discussed pretty fully and copiously; in our three preceding discourses on this subject: and proved its truth and certainty, by

E

the

the express testimony of many passages of scripture; and by many conclusive arguments and considerations suggested by the nature of things; and the genuine dictates of right reason. We enter to day upon the consideration of the second proposition, viz. That Jesus Christ is not the most high God; but a being inferior to him, dependent upon him, and acting by his command and authority: or in other words his Son, Servant, and messenger; and by the Father's appointment, the Messiah, or only Mediator between God and Man. That they might know Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

The knowledge of Jesus Christ is made necessary to life eternal; as well as the knowledge of the only true God the Father who sent him. Because, Jesus is the great messenger and ambassador of the Father, the great medium of the divine communications with mankind; the way, the truth, and the life, by whom we have access to the God and Father of all. It is necessary to know the SENT, as well as the SENDER; the ambassador, and he who appoints and authorizes him to act: but we must take care at the same time, not to confound the different and distinct characters of each. We must honour the Son, because he is sent, and because he bears the Father's commission, and acts in his name, and by his authority. But we must honour the Father, on account of his own independent and undervived authority and excellence; which render him superior to all other beings whatever.

Far be it from me to wish, to depreciate the character of Jesus, the Son, Servant, and Messenger, of the most high God: to make him less great, less venerable, less amiable, than he really is. Such an intention would be highly culpable in itself; and a very ungrateful return, for that benevolence, tender regard, and deep concern, which that excellent person discovered for the best and most valuable interests of mankind. If we would speak of our Lord Jesus Christ justly, and truly, we must speak of him as he spoke of himself; and agreeably to the language of divine revelation. If we do this we can
never

never err; but we may err, and that capitally, by following human standards and forms of speaking concerning him. Divine revelation being then the only certain criterion to direct us, we ought to try all our opinions by this infallible rule: and be ready to renounce even the most favourite notions, when after due examination and enquiry, they are found to be inconsistent with the genuine sense of sacred scripture. Can any person think to please the meek and humble Jesus, by bestowing titles upon, and ascribing honours to him, which he never claimed? By raising him to a proper equality with that God and Father of all, to whom he always professed the most implicit subjection; and the most unreserved obedience. It can be no disparagement to any character, (however excellent and meritorious) to forbear ascribing to it, what does not properly belong to it. It is no detraction from the dignity of the highest Peer of the realm, to say that he is not the King of Great Britain. Persons of just discernment and good sense amongst mankind, disdain to receive titles that do not belong to them. Far more may we suppose our Lord Jesus Christ, to be superior to every thing of this kind.

When arrayed in heavenly glory he spoke to Saul of Tarsus, in his way to Damascus; and when Saul put the question to him, "Who art thou Lord?" He did not reply, I am God the Son, or, I am the second person of the Trinity equal with the first: but his answer was, "I am Jesus of Nazareth whom thou persecutest" Besides, by ascribing titles and prerogatives to our Lord Jesus Christ unauthorized by scripture, we dishonour his Father, and our Father, his God, and our God. We dishonour the Father by giving away his peculiar glory to another, which he has declared he will not give; and we dishonour the Son by contradicting the testimony, he has given both of his Father and of himself. He who refused the title of GOOD MASTER, when on earth, can never be gratified with that of the MOST HIGH GOD; now he is in heaven. If it be true, that
he

† Acts, xxii. 8.

he that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father who hath sent him; it must also be true, that he that honoureth not the Father who sent the Son, with that supreme and peculiar adoration which is due to the Father alone: honoureth not the Son, who came to declare and command it.

This being premised, we proceed without further preamble, or apology, to the direct proof of our second proposition. And First, Jesus Christ is not nor cannot rationally be supposed to be the most high God; or God in the proper and sublime sense of that word, because he is in scripture plainly distinguished from God. Now distinction always supposes diversity. No being can be distinguished from itself. And Jesus Christ being distinguished from, and opposed to God, in a vast number of places of scripture: every one of these places ought to be considered, as a plain and express denial, that he is God. We shall select a few of them, 1 Tim. v. 21. "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels that thou observe these things &c." Here we see God, the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, mentioned together in a solemn adjuration: and yet plainly distinguished from one another, and spoken of, as different and distinct beings as they really are: so that there can be no pretence for blending and confounding them, which will not argue as strongly in favour of the elect angels, as our Lord Jesus Christ. Heb. xii. 22. "But ye are come unto mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first born which are written in heaven, to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant &c" How clearly is Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, distinguished in this passage, from God the judge of all; who is before styled the living God: The innumerable company of angels and the spirits of just men made perfect, may just as well be supposed to be beings of the same species,, as God, and Jesus. 1 Tim.

Tim. ii. 5. There is one God; and one Mediator between God and Man the Man Christ Jesus. Here, the one God, and the one Mediator, are contrasted in such a manner, as cannot escape the observation of any person, who thinks or reasons at all upon what he reads: and it must be attended with the greatest absurdity and confusion, to suppose the Mediator between God and Man, to be in any respect that God with whom he mediates in behalf of men: for then he must mediate with himself. Again, the words of our text contain as striking an opposition, betwixt God and our Lord Jesus Christ as can well be imagined. "This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." So that we may save ourselves the trouble of quoting any more texts, in proof of what is so clear and evident.

Secondly. Jesus Christ is not, and cannot be the most high God, because he is the Son of God. Now God, and the Son of God, are two distinct and different things. In what different senses the scriptures call Jesus the Son of God, we shall shew immediately. In general we may consider Jesus as being called the Son of God, because he is the object of the Father's peculiar complacency and regard: who on the account of his having eminently loved righteousness and hated iniquity, is anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows. But to come to the senses in which this title of Son of God, is conferred upon Jesus Christ. Our Lord Jesus Christ is called the Son of God upon account of his miraculous conception in the Virgin's womb, without the instrumentality of any human progenitor. We have this history of our Lord's wonderful conception and birth, very particularly recorded by St. Matthew, and St. Luke. Mat. i. 18 to 23. "Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: when as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the holy ghost. Then Joseph her husband being a just man (or as some render it, a merciful, or compassionate man) and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her

her away privily. But while he thought on these things, behold, the Angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joleph, thou Son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her, is of the Holy Ghost. And she shall bring forth a Son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins. Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the Prophet, saying, beho'd, a Virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a Son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, (which being interpreted, is, God with us. †)” St. Luke is still more precise in relating the circumstances of this transaction. Luke, i. 26 to 35. “ And in the sixth month, the Angel Gabriel was sent from God, unto a City of Galilee named Nazareth, to a Virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joleph, of the house of David; and the Virgin's name was Mary. And the Angel came in unto her, and said, hail, thou that art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women. And when she saw him, she was troubled at his saying, and cast in her mind what manner of salutation this should be. And the Angel said unto her, fear not, Mary, for thou hast found favour with God. And behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a Son, and shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his Father David. And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.

† The expression Emmanuel, God with us, does not denote as some have absurdly supposed, that Jesus was God; or that God was incarnate in him, which is impossible: but only that God should manifest himself by Jesus to his people, and should be with him in a singular and extraordinary manner, agreeably to what St. Peter says, Acts, x. 38. “ God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him.

ead. Then said Mary unto the Angel, how shall this be seeing I know not a man? And the Angel answered and said unto her, the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God.' The miraculous conception of Jesus seems to have been alluded to, in the first promise of the Messiah to mankind after the fall: and it is certain that St. Paul very plainly refers to it in these words, Gal. iv. 4. "But when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, *GENOMENON EK GUNAIKOS*, made of a woman, made under the law." In this supernatural production of Jesus by the power of God, which the Evangelists have recorded, we have a very plain and intelligible sense in which he may be called the Son of God. All mankind are produced (our first parents excepted who were created), according to that settled law of generation, which God has established for the propagation of mankind. But our Lord Jesus Christ was an exception to this general law. He was produced by the immediate power of God himself: and therefore on this account, may be styled not only the Son; but the only begotten Son of God: because God never formed any of his creatures in a familiar manner.

2d. Jesus is the Son of God because he is the MESSIAH or the CHRIST, promised and foretold by the Prophets; and sanctified and set apart by the Father, for that high and honourable office. John, x. 34. 35. 36. "Jesus answered them, is it not written in your law, I said, ye are Gods? If he called them Gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scriptures cannot be broken: say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent unto the world, thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?" In this passage, our Saviour claims the title of Son of God, only, - on account of the Father's sanctification, or his being the anointed of God: only on account of those wonderful endowments, and extraordinary qualifications, which the Father had bestowed upon him as the great teacher and instructor of mankind.

mankind ; and the author of the Gospel dispensation. The words Christ, and Son of God, were considered by the Jews, as terms of the same import and meaning : thus Mat. xvi 16. " Peter answered and said, thou art the Christ the Son of the living God." John, xii 27. Martha says, " Lord, I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world " Mat. xxvi, 63. " And the high priests said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Acts viii 37. " And he answered and said (the Eunuch) I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, John. xx. 31 " These (things) are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name." These quotations make it abundantly evident, that the first followers of our Lord considered the Sonship of Jesus, and his being the Christ or anointed of God, as one and the same thing : and they seem to have laid a greater stress on this, than on any of the other senses, in which Jesus is called the Son of God. Because this sense included in it, a belief of the divine mission of Jesus : and of his authority as a teacher sent from God ; and of that fulness of the spirit which dwelt in him, and whereby he performed all his miraculous works, John, i. 32. 33. 39. " And John bare record, saying, I saw the spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. And I knew him not ; but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, upon whom thou shalt see the spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God "

3d. Jesus Christ is called the Son of God, on account of his resurrection from the dead, by the power of God. Rom. i. 3. 4. " Concerning his Son Jesus Christ, our Lord, which was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh ; and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead."

Our

Our Lord was descended from the house, or family of David; and therefore is said to be of the seed of David, according the flesh. Although our Lord was conceived by the power of God, yet he took flesh of the Virgin at the same time, and had a body of the same structure that other men have: but with regard to the spirit of holiness which was imparted to him without measure, he was the Son of God with power; and was declared or defined to be so in a public and open manner, by his resurrection from the dead. Acts, xiii. 32 3. "And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto the Fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee" Here, God is said to have begotten Jesus, because, he raised him from the dead by his almighty power. For a like reason, he is called, Rev. i. 5. "The first begotten of the dead: and Col. i. 18. "The first born from the dead."

4th Jesus may be also called the Son of God, on account of his exaltation at the right hand of God and his being appointed by God the judge of the living and the dead. John. iii. 35. "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand." John v. 21. 22. "The Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgement unto the Son." Heb i. 1. 2. "God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in times past unto the Fathers by the Prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things." Heb iii. 5. 6. "Moses verily was faithful in all his house as a servant,—But Christ as a Son over his own house." This exaltation of Christ may also be alluded to in Psalms xxviii. 27. "I will make him my first born, higher than the Kings of the earth." To the same subject perhaps may also be referred, Heb. v. 5. "So also Christ glorified not himself, to be made an high priest; but he that said unto him, thou art my Son, to day have I begotten thee."

5th. If we consider the following passages (Col. i. 15 "Who (viz Jesus Christ) is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature," and Rev. iii. 14. "These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God") as relating to the first creation, it may be affirmed that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, because he was the first being whom God produced or created: but several learned commentators are of opinion, that these passages relate to the new creation, or moral renovation of the world; and it is certain that Jesus Christ is never expressly said to be the Son of God in this sense by any inspired writer.

These are all the senses that I can discover in sacred scripture, in which Jesus is expressly called the Son of God; or from which that title may be fairly inferred. But the Trinitarians, who chuse, to be wise beyond what is written, have feigned or imagined another sense, in which they say Jesus is the Son of God; and upon which they lay far more stress than upon any of the scriptural senses, in which he is so called. They represent the Son of God, as a divine person equal with the Father in every respect, begotten by him in an incomprehensible manner; and of the same essence and substance with the Father. But it is enough to say in reply; that this is a Son of God of their own invention and contrivance, of whom the scriptures say not a word. Although the Trinitarians have been repeatedly challenged, they could never produce a single passage from the sacred records, affirming, that Jesus is the Son of God because he is consubstantial with the Father; or begotten from all eternity out of his essence or substance. The Unitarians can shew clear and distinct testimonies, for the different senses in which they affirm Jesus to be the Son of God: but their opponents have not yet been able to produce any, for the supposed consubstantial Sonship of Jesus. And can we suppose that the Evangelists and Apostles, would have been negligent in recording a doctrine of this kind, if it had been founded in truth? Can we suppose, that they would have particularly mentioned, various senses in which

which Jesus is styled the Son of God : and yet have omitted what in the judgement of our opponents is the most important of any? Is it reasonable to think, that they would have left this point to be discovered, and settled, by the penetration of Fathers, Councils and Scholastic divines? How easy would it have been to have expressed it in their writings, in the same plain and intelligible manner, in which the miraculous conception, the Messiahship, the resurrection, and exaltation of Jesus is recorded. When we read in scripture that Jesus is the Son of God, we are not warranted to frame an arbitrary and precarious hypothesis of our own, concerning the nature of his filiation, or Sonship. We ought to have recourse to the written word ; and after having investigated the scripture meaning of the term, it is necessary to abide by the definitions which the sacred penmen have given of it.

From these considerations, it appears, how unjustly the Unitarians have been accused of denying the Sonship of our Lord Jesus Christ. We admit it, in every sense which bears the genuine stamp of divine revelation; in every sense, in which the Evangelists, Apostles, and first converts to christianity acknowledged it. We reject only those false and erroneous ideas, which the corrupters of pure and undefiled religion have annexed to the term. For, all the proofs and evidences that the Trinitarians can bring in favour of their pretended consubstantial filiation, are either drawn from figurative, mistaken, and ill translated passages, (which will be obviated and illustrated in our reply to their objections) and which even as they stand will not answer their purpose ; or inferred from one irrational conclusion of theirs, viz. That because according to the constitution of human nature, a man begets a son out of his own essence, therefore, God must do so also. But this is departing from the scripture acceptation of the term, and reasoning from human ideas and analogies. It is besides ascribing to God, corporeal affections, and passions, which his all-perfect nature does not admit of. For God is a pure
and

and perfect spirit, incapable of division of essence, or separation of substance, And this some of the more acute Trinitarians are aware of, and therefore chuse to depart from the analogy of human generation; and affirm (although they do not know their own meaning when they do affirm it,) that the whole divine essence, and not a part of it is begotten, and is transferred to, and subsists in the Son, under a different Hypostasis, or personality. But this assertion of theirs is absurd and contradictory in itself; or rather is a mass of contradictions and absurdities. For first it follows, that the Father parted with all his essence to the Son; and yet retains it all at the same time. Secondly, that the Son is his own Father, and his own Son. For as upon this scheme he possesses all the divine essence, or self-existent substance, even the very individual essence of the Father, he must be considered as the Father in one respect and as the Son in another: or in other words, he will be begotten and unbegotten at the same time. Another absurdity, which naturally follows from the notion of an eternal generation of the Father's essence or substance, is this, that upon this scheme the Son of God, is affirmed to exist, and yet not to exist from all eternity. For although they say that he existed from all eternity, yet when they assert also, that he was begotten, this implies an act performed at some particular time, which is inconsistent with the idea of eternal duration. For whoever began to exist at a certain period, there must have been a time when he did not exist. If to avoid this contradiction they assert, that the Son's generation was performed at no particular period whatever, then it will follow, that he never was begotten at all: but that he is always generating, but never generated. These are a short specimen of the many absurdities, that result from the scheme of an eternal and consubstantial generation of the Son of God. Confusion and Darkness are the natural consequences of error; but truth has a beauty and simplicity in it, which is amiable to all beholders. It is altogether ridiculous to suppose one divine individual essence,

essence, to subsist under different personalities, and those who do so, talk without Ideas, or any proper conception of their own meaning; and are obliged always to have recourse to the term Mystery, **INEFFABLE MYSTERY**, to shelter themselves from the force of arguments, to which they are unable to give any adequate reply. But it should be remembered, that there is a Mystery of iniquity, as well as a Mystery of Godliness. We have no authority to invent absurdities of our own, or to receive those of others upon trust; and call them by the name of christian mysteries. Besides the word mystery in Scripture never signifies, a thing incomprehensible and unintelligible in its own nature; which no penetration or sagacity whatever can unfold or explain. This is a false and erroneous Idea annexed to the word by modern writers. The word in its proper acceptation, signifies only a thing hidden or concealed, which could not have been known without being revealed. But after it has been revealed, it ceases to be a mystery or secret thing any longer, and becomes open and manifest to all persons. How much has the lustre of our most holy Religion been darkened; and the plain sense of the Scriptures obscured, by the false notions and chimerical Ideas of some of its mistaken professors. Let us take care my Brethren, that no man seduce us from the purity of the Faith; and form us after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. Let us converse frequently with the sacred oracles, and endeavour to enter into their true Spirit and genuine meaning; and that will be the best and most effectual preservative, against error and delusion of every kind. To the one living and true God, the Father of lights, with whom there is variableness neither shadow of turning; and from whom proceedeth every good and perfect gift, be glory by Christ Jesus, for ever,
AMEN.

DISCOURSES ON THE DIVINE UNITY.

DISCOURSE V.

John Chap. xvii. ver. 3. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

WHEN we entered upon the great and important doctrine of the divine Unity, we proposed to make these words the ground-work and basis of our reasoning; and by an appeal to the Scriptures at large, to endeavour to enforce and establish the following propositions.

First. That there is one person, or intelligent agent, who alone is God, supreme, almighty, and eternal: and that this one person is the Father; or as he is sometimes called in scripture, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. This is life eternal that they might know thee the only true God.

Secondly. That Jesus Christ is not the most high God, but *a* being inferior to him, dependent upon him and acting by his command and authority: or in other words his Son, Servant, and Messenger; and by the Father's appointment the Messiah, or only Mediator between God and Man. That they might know Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

And Thirdly and Lastly. To consider and answer the objections, that the Trinitarians make to our hypothesis; and urge in support of their own, founded on various places both of the Old and New Testament.

The first of these propositions has been already fully considered, and in our fourth discourse we entered upon the proof of the second, viz. That Jesus Christ is not
the

the most high God : but a being inferior to him, dependent upon him, and acting by his command and authority : or in other words his Son, Servant, and Messenger ; and by the Father's appointment the Messiah, or only Mediator between God and Man. That they might know Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. We shewed first, that Jesus Christ is distinguished from God in scripture, and therefore cannot be that God from whom he is distinguished ; and to whom he is opposed. We shewed in the second place, that Jesus Christ cannot be God, because he is the Son of God, For to be God, and the Son of God too, is impossible ; and implies a contradiction. This would be to make Jesus Christ, his own Father, and his own Son ; or would be equivalent to saying, that he was begotten and unbegotten at the same time. We pointed out the different senses, in which the scriptures declare Jesus to be the Son of God, viz. On account of his miraculous conception by the power of God, of a Virgin mother ; on account of his consecration to the Messiahship, or his being anointed with the holy spirit without measure ; on account of his resurrection from the dead, by the mighty working of the Father's power : on account of his ascension into heaven, and his exaltation to a state of dignity, dominion, and glory, at the right hand of God : and according to the language of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, being made a high priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec. We took notice of all these different senses, in which Jesus is called the Son of God : and confirmed them by express testimonies from holy writ. But at the same time we observed, that the scriptures afford us no foundation, for ascribing a consubstantial Sonship to Jesus : or an eternal filiation from the Father's essence. We mentioned several gross contradictions resulting from the belief of this opinion : and could have enlarged much farther on this subject. But as the scriptures are silent concerning it, there is no occasion for reasoning farther about a non-entity ; or a thing which is not recorded.

Thirdly, but to proceed in our argument ; that Jesus Christ
is

is not the most high God, or God in the proper and sublime sense of that word, is evident, because, he always professed to have no will of his own; but to be ever entirely guided and governed, by the will of his heavenly Father John vi, 38. For I came down from heaven, (says our Lord) not to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me. And during his agony in the Garden, he thus expresses himself Math. xxvi 39. "Father, if it be possible let this cup pass from me; nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt." These are expressions, denoting a state of absolute dependence and subjection; and utterly inconsistent with proper deity. If our Lord Jesus Christ had been God, he must have been regulated solely by his own will; and never could have been directed so implicitly by the will of another.

Fourthly Jesus Christ cannot be the most high God, because, he is said not only in the words of our text; but in many other passages of scripture, to be sent of God, Now to be sent by God, or to be God's messenger; and to be God himself, are quite opposite and contrary ideas. John xii 44. "He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me. Mat x. 40. "He that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me." In these places, Jesus represents himself as an ambassador from Almighty God. But it is impossible to believe that a person equal in dignity with the Almighty, could be an ambassador from him. Besides, the idea of being sent, is quite inconsistent with that sameness of essence, which the Trinitarians ascribe to the Father and the Son. The Son (upon their scheme) possessed the same individual essence with the Father; and therefore, could not leave the Father, could not be separated from him, or act as his messenger. But it is the express doctrine of the scriptures, that Christ was sent by the Father; and in the chapter of which our text forms a part, it is repeatedly asserted, John xvii 8. "For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send

ME."

ME." Ver. 21. "That they all may be one; as thou Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast SENT ME." Ver. 23. "I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one, and that the world may know that thou hast SENT ME" Ver. 25. "O righteous Father, the world hath not known thee: but I have known thee; and these have known that thou hast SENT ME" These are only a few of many places, in scripture, wherein Christ declares that he was sent by the Father; and from this consideration, it inevitably follows, that he was a being of a different nature and essence from the Father; and inferior in dignity to him.

In the fifth place, Jesus Christ is not the most high God, or the all perfect and omnipotent being, because, he denies himself (as do also his Apostles) to be the proper author of his miraculous works; and refers all these operations to the Father; or the Holy Ghost, which in most (if not in all) places of scripture, signifies nothing else, but the power, influence, or energy, of God the Father. As this is a point of great importance, we shall quote the passages of scripture, wherein Christ speaks in this manner, distinctly and at large, and make our remarks upon them as we go along. Our Saviour having cured an impotent man on the sabbath-day, the Jews who were ever ready to find fault with him, accused him of having broken the sabbath: and sought to kill him on that account. Jesus replies, John v. 17. "My Father worketh hitherto and I work." The meaning of this was, that as almighty God performed works of charity and mercy on the sabbath day, so he his Son might do the same also. Upon which the Jews, still more incensed, were desirous of destroying him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was his Father; making himself equal with God. Our Saviour had not given the least occasion for this accusation, more than the former; it was only a malicious construction that the Jews had put upon his words.

H

But

But let us attend to the manner, in which Christ clears himself from this charge. He does not say (as Trinitarians say now) I am the eternal Son of God, the second person of the ever blessed Trinity, of the same nature and essence with the Father; and therefore have a good title to assume an equality with the Father. But in his reply, he gives up all pretensions to such an equality. John. v. 19 to 31, inclusive. "Then answered Jesus, and said unto them, verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. For the Father loveth the Son; and sheweth him all things that himself doeth: and he will shew him greater works than these, that ye may marvel. For as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. For the Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgement unto the Son: that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father which hath sent him. Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life and shall not come unto condemnation; but is passed from death unto life. Verily, verily, I say unto you; the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgement also, because he is the Son of Man. Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth: they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation. I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge, and my judgement is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me. If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true. There is another

ther that beareth witness of me, and I know that the witness which he witnesseth of me is true." Here, our Lord positively asserts, that he can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; or that the Father's all powerful agency must concur with him in the operation of every miracle; that having this agency, he is enabled to perform these wonderful works: but without it, is altogether impotent; and incapable of performing them. He represents himself as the Father's scholar; or indicates that the Father sheweth him all things that himself doeth; and declares that the Father will shew him or enable him to perform, still greater works, than the curing this impotent man; to the utter astonishment of the Jews; and to the confusion of their incredulity. He informs them, that the Father hath committed all judgement to him, and that therefore men should give him all that honour and respect which is due to one to whom so high and important an office is delegated; in like manner, (for the particle *as* is far from denoting an equal degree of honour) as they honour the Father, the original source of all authority and power. And that if they fail in doing this, they dishonour the Father who sent the Son; and who is bound to indicate the honour of his ambassador. He declares ver. 26 that as the Father hath life; or the power of raising the dead in himself, so he hath conferred this glorious power upon the Son also; and that in consequence of it, he will be enabled to raise the dead at the last day; and to reward or punish them according to their works. To prevent any possibility of misunderstanding his meaning; and to deprive every person of a handle, for ascribing his present miracles: or the future resurrection of the dead, to his own power or agency, he again solemnly declares; and more clearly and emphatically than before ver. 30. "I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgement is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me." He adds farther Ver. 31. 32. That his own testimony concerning himself, would have been incompetent and inadequate:

inadequate: but that the testimony of another; or the evidence of those miracles, which the Father enabled him to perform, could alone ascertain the validity of his divine mission. This thought is expressed in other words, in Ver. 36. of this chapter. "But I have greater witness than that of John: for the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me." Could a being that was God; or equal with the God of heaven and earth, ever express himself in this manner? The idea is impossible and cannot be admitted!

John 14. 9-10. "Jesus saith unto him (unto Philip,) have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father: and how sayest thou then, shew us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself; but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works. The expressions, "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father, and believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me" have been sometimes weakly urged by the Trinitarians, to prove some kind of mutual inexistence; or mysterious union, betwixt two co-equal intelligent agents or persons, such as they suppose the Father and the Son be. But an attentive consideration of the passage, will utterly destroy this notion. For, when our Lord declares, that the Father dwelt in him and performed his miraculous works, this clearly explains his meaning: and also shews, that there was no agency of his own in the case; and consequently that he was no such divine person equal with the Father; as the Trinitarians represent him to be. And as to Jesus being in the Father, and the Father in him; this is explained in the 20 verse of this chapter, where the same thing is affirmed of Jesus and his disciples, "At that day ye shall know, that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you." From this passage then we have a clear demonstration; that neither the words, nor works of Jesus, were to be considered as his own; that

that the former were the suggestions of the Father's wisdom; and the latter the operations of his irresistible power. Luke iv. 16. to 19. "And he (Jesus) came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up, and as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the sabbath-day, and stood up for to read. And there was delivered to him the book of the prophet Esaias; and when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written, the spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised; to preach the acceptable year of the Lord." Here we find, that it was the unction of the holy spirit; or the divine influences and communications of the Father, which qualified our Lord for entering upon, and discharging every part of his great and important office. The prophet Isaiah Chap. ii. Ver. 1. 2. 3. gives a like description of the Messiah; and of his qualifications. "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots. And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord; and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord, &c." Math. 12. 27. "But if I cast out devils by the spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you." What in Mathews Gospel, is called the spirit of God; is by Luke termed the finger of God. Luke: ii. 20. "But if I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you." Acts ii. 22. "Ye men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth a man approved among you, by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know." Acts, x. 38. God anointed Jesus of Nazareth, with the holy Ghost, and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him."

From

From the plain and obvious meaning, of all these passages of scripture taken together, it is evident, that the Trinitarians have no reason to infer the divinity of Jesus Christ; or his equality with the Father; from his raising the dead, giving sight to the blind, making the dumb to speak, the lame to walk, curing obstinate and inveterate diseases, casting out devils, feeding multitudes with a few loaves and fishes; or from any other great and wonderful action that he performed. How often do the Trinitarians declaim upon these subjects; and insist upon them as decisive proofs, of his supreme divinity and infinite power. How apt are they to upbraid and censure those, who will not admit (as they think) such plain and unequivocal proofs of true Godhead. But it is evident, from the plain and express testimony of Christ and his Apostles, that Jesus never performed a single miracle by any natural inherent, or independent power of his own. His own lips which never uttered any thing but what was strictly agreeable to truth, have repeatedly declared, that of himself he could do nothing; that the Father which dwelt in him did the works; and that he cast out devils by the spirit of God. And his immediate followers, who cannot be supposed to have had any intention to lessen the dignity of their honoured master, assure us of the very same thing. Vain and futile therefore, are all the evasions, and false conclusions of the Trinitarians. It is quite idle and trifling, to have recourse to the pretended distinction of natures, to get rid of this perplexing difficulty. If Jesus really had the eternal Word or Son, hypostatically united to his human soul: why does he not appeal to this divine principle, as the natural and proper author of his miraculous works? What occasion had he for the assistance of the first, and third persons, of the supposed Trinity, who was already in personal union with the second which upon this scheme is equal in dignity with the other two. Upon the Unitarian hypothesis, it is absolutely necessary, that God should anoint Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power, that the spirit should be imparted to him without measure, and that he should receive of the Father's

Father's fulness. Without these communications, Jesus would have been unfit for the discharge of his mediatorial office. But all these qualifications form a propesterous assemblage upon the Trinitarian scheme, and no good reason can be given why they should be bestowed upon Jesus at all; or rather, their being bestowed, plainly proves, that no such principle or agent, as an eternal Word or Son equal with the Father, ever resided in Jesus, or formed one person with him.

But in the sixth place, Jesus Christ is not the most high God; but a being inferior to him, and dependent upon him, because, he is said to receive commands from the Father, and to give an unreserved obedience to these commands. John x. 18. "No man taketh my life from me, but I lay it down of myself; I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father;" John, xii. 49 50. "For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak: and I know that his commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak," John, xiv. 31. "As the Father gave me commandment, even so I do." John, xv. 10. "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love." Is this the language of supreme deity, to receive commands from another, and to yield a ready obedience to them. Whoever receives commands from another, acknowledges that other person, as his superior; and as having a natural title to his obedience. Our Lord Jesus Christ professes, not in a single instance only; but in all his words and actions, to be guided by a sacred regard to the Father's commandments; and to continue in his love on this account: and is even willing to lay down his life, in obedience to the will of the Lord of heaven and earth. What can more fully prove the sovereign authority of the Father; and the inferiority and dependence of our Lord, than these considerations.

To this part of our subject may also be referred, all those places of scripture, wherein Christ is prophesied of as, or called the servant of God. Isaiah xlii. 1. and Mat. xii. 18. "Behold, my servant whom I behold mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth. I have put my spirit upon him. &c." See also Isaiah 52. 13 and 53. 11.

In the ~~first~~^{7th} place Jesus Christ is not the most high God; or the only wise and perfect being, because he declares, that he was not the original author of his own doctrine, John vii. 15 16 17. 18. "And the Jews marvelled, saying, how knoweth this man letters, having never learned Jesus answered them, and said, my doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself. He that speaketh of himself, seeketh his own glory: but he that seeketh his glory that sent him, the same is true, and no unrighteousness is in him." John viii. 28. "Then said Jesus unto them when ye have lifted up the son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself, but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things." John xiv. 24. "He that loveth me not, keepeth not my sayings: and the word which ye hear, is not mine, but the Father's which sent me." John, viii. 38. "I speak that which I have seen with my Father." Ver. 40. "But now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God." John iii. 34. "For he whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the spirit by measure unto him." From these citations, it is evident to a demonstration, that all the heavenly doctrines which Jesus taught, and all the precious truths which he delivered, and made known to mankind, were derived from the Father; and consequently it must be extremely absurd, to suppose Jesus to be God: or equal with God. For in that case his own infinite wisdom must, and would have suggested to him every part of his doctrine; and he would have had no occasion to have been taught of the Father, to have learned of the Father; or

or to have heard of the Father ; as he expressly declares he did. Nor will it avail the Trinitarians any thing, to have recourse to his pretended divine nature here : for Jesus does not appeal to any divine nature of his own, but to the Father, as the author of his wisdom and knowledge.

In the eight place, Jesus Christ is not the most high God : but a subordinate dependent being, because, he prays to the Father. Now prayer always implies a state of great subjection and inferiority. To talk of God praying to himself : or of one God praying to another God, would be equally extravagant and absurd. Whoever prays to another, acknowledges that being to whom he prays as his superior ; and as having something in his power to confer or bestow, which he does not possess who prays for it. Luke, vi. 12. " And it came to pass in those days, that he went out into a mountain to pray and continued all night in prayer to God." Luke, ix. 18. And it came to pass, as he was alone praying his disciples were with him, &c." Ver. 28. " And it came to pass about an eight days after these sayings, he took Peter, and John, and James, and went up into a mountain to pray." Luke, xxii. 41 to 44. " And he was withdrawn from them about a stone's cast, and kneeled down, and prayed, saying, Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me : nevertheless, not my will, but thine be done. And there appeared an Angel from Heaven, strengthening him. And being in an agony, he prayed more earnestly : and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling to the ground." See also Mat. xxvi. 38. 39. and Mark, xiv. 33 to 36. and Luke, xxiii. 34. " Then said Jesus, Father forgive them, for they know not what they do." Ver. 26. " And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." This chapter also of which our text forms a part, is a prayer of considerable length, addressed by Jesus with great humility, to the God and Father of all. When these passages are seriously and attentively considered, how clearly mani-
I
fest

felt does it appear, that Jesus Christ was destitute of proper deity. If Christ had possessed a divine nature equal with the Father, he would have been sufficient for himself; and abundantly able to have supplied all his own wants. His divinity would either have preserved him from these distressful circumstances; or would have delivered him from them, without the interposition of any other power. But we find it was quite otherwise with Jesus. We find him praying with fervour, earnestness, and submission; and St. Luke informs us, that an Angel from heaven was sent to console and strengthen him, in the height of his agony. And can we imagine, that a person hypostatically united to the supreme deity, could need the assistance of an Angel; or be strengthened and assisted by one of his own creatures? I know the Trinitarians will tell us that Christ prayed, to give us an example of prayer; and in order to be a pattern of devotion to his followers. And so he certainly was, and a most noble and excellent pattern too. But then, our Lord might have recommended prayer strongly to his followers, without committing an evident absurdity himself which it certainly was for him to pray, if he was God equal with the Father. And this absurdity will appear still the greater, if we consider the manner in which Christ prayed, his retiring to mountains and solitudes, the length and fervency of his devotion; and above all his agony in the garden. To this the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews seems to have alluded, when he tells us, Heb. v. 7. "That in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to save him from death; and was heard, in that he feared; or on account of his piety." Here, our Lord is described, as praying with the greatest ardour and intensity; and mingling strong crying and tears with his supplications, like one deeply interested in the success of his prayers; and sensible of his own insufficiency, and the need he had of the assistance of a being far more powerful than himself. And we are told that on account of his
filial

filial piety, † and humble resignation, he was heard, or met with a favourable answer to his prayers. From a consideration then of the manner and circumstances in which our Lord prayed, we have the highest reason to conclude, that he was a person inferior in nature and character to almighty God.

In the ninth place, Jesus Christ is not the most high God; but a different and distinct being from him, because, he is styled in scripture the image of God. 2 Cor. iv. 4. The Apostle observes speaking of bad men who reject the Gospel, that the God of this world hath blinded their eyes, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them. Col. i. 15. "Who is the image of the invisible God," and Heb i. 3. Christ is said to be the express image of God's person. Now this appellation evidently discovers to us, that Christ cannot be of the same nature or essence with God, because in this case, he would be the image of himself, which is a contradiction. Adam is declared to have been made after the image of God; and all mankind are said to be made after the same image, in James iii 9, where speaking of the tongue he says, "Therewith bless we God even the Father; and therewith curse we men who are made after the similitude or image of God. Christ is said to be the express image of God, because he is the great revealer of his will, the most illustrious and dignified of his creatures; and because in him the perfections of the Father shine forth more eminently, than in any other being. But there is an express distinction made betwixt him and the invisible God, whose image he is said to be.

In the tenth place, Jesus Christ is not the most high God: or the eternal and self-existent deity, because, he is styled, Col. i. 15: "The first born of every creature." and Rev. iii. 14, he styles himself. "The faithful and true witness the beginning of the creation of God."

† The Greek words ΑΠΟ ΤΗΣ ΕΥΛΑΒΕΙΑΣ, may be rendered on account of his piety, or reverence of God.

God." In the first of these passages it is affirmed of Christ, that he was born or produced, which naturally implies, that there was a time when he did not exist; and also that he derived his being or existence from another. For no being can produce itself; and no self-existent eternal being can ever be affirmed to be born at all. Christ is also here, ranked or comprehended amongst the number of creatures, by being styled the first born of every creature. Nor is there any way to avoid this conclusion; but by doing violence to the words of scripture, and perverting their plain and obvious meaning. Some Trinitarians have made attempts of this kind, by insisting that the words ought to be rendered, "the first bringer forth of every creature;" but a learned commentator has well shewn, the impropriety of this translation. His words are as follows. "This passage is fairly rendered by our Translators, and indeed the word is never used in any other sense in the New Testament. It is true, that *PROTOKOS* is found sometimes used by profane authors in an active sense, as when applied to a Dam the first time she brings forth; and accordingly some would render the expression here, "the first bringer forth of every creature; but it may be questioned whether ever the word is thus used with a genitive case after it, and especially with such an adjective as *ALL* joined with that genitive case. Who can find such an expression any where as this, "a Dam that is the first bringer forth of all her offspring?" If the word were here to be taken in this sense, St. Paul's meaning must be expressed by some such periphrasis as this: "Christ is one, who the first time he brought forth any thing, brought forth every creature; which I suppose, will hardly satisfy any man." †

The second passage, in which Christ styles himself, "the beginning of the creation of God," confirms the interpretation we have given of the first; and proves, that it is no violation of the honour and dignity of our great

† Mr. Pierce of Exeter in loco,

great and excellent master to call him a creature; since he takes that title to himself; and freely declares to his Apostle, and beloved and favourite disciple John; that he is a part of the general creation of God.

In the eleventh place. Jesus Christ is not the most high God; but a dependent inferior being, because he is said in scripture to have been tempted of the Devil.— Now the Apostle James informs us, “that God cannot be tempted of evil.” The perfect and infinite nature of God, set him above all possibility of temptation: and if the soul of Jesus had been in personal union with a divine agent, equal to God the Father, it would be altogether absurd to suppose him to be tempted. But we are told by three Evangelists; that Jesus was led by the spirit into the wilderness; that he might be tempted of the Devil. See Mat. iv. 1. Mark, i. 12. and Luke, iv. 1.

“ But this temptation cannot be supposed to have hap-
 “ pened, if Jesus had been the most high God. For,
 “ first what is more unworthy of God, then to expose
 “ himself to this base and impious enemy; whom for
 “ the contempt of his majesty he had expelled from his
 “ presence; to permit this spirit to solicit him to wor-
 “ ship him; and thus to offer himself of his own ac-
 “ cord, to be mocked and insulted by the Devil. Again,
 “ (upon the Trinitarian scheme) it may be asked, for
 “ what purpose should Christ permit an attempt of this
 “ kind? Was it that it might appear, that the most
 “ high God was able to endure and overcome the temp-
 “ tations of the Devil? Was there any one that could
 “ entertain the least doubt of this; so as that it should
 “ be necessary to make a tryal of it? Farther, how can
 “ we suppose the Devil to undertake so arduous an en-
 “ terprize as this; or to have the least hope of success
 “ in it.” † There are some ingenious and learned per-
 sons, who suppose all this tryal and temptation of Jesus
 to have been a mysterious trance or vision, and that no
 evil being was concerned in it: and that the intention of
 this vision, was to prepare and strengthen the mind of
 Jesus

† *Crellius de uno deo patre.*

Jesus for the trials and troubles he was to undergo in the course of his ministry. But this conjecture makes equally against the Trinitarians : for what occasion could HE have for trials and preparatory exercises of any kind ; who was really and truly God, and so complete in all perfections and excellencies, and above the possibility of temptation of any kind.

But in the twelfth place, Jesus Christ is not the most high God ; because, he is said in scripture to be a Priest, and sometimes a high Priest, Psal. cx. 4. " The Lord hath sworn, and will not repeat, thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec." Heb. ili. 1. 2. " Consider the Apostle and high Priest of our profession. Christ Jesus, who was faithful to him that appointed him," or as it may be more literally rendered, " to him that made him." Heb. iv. 14. " Seeing then, that we have a great high Priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession." And in many other places, Christ has this title given him. A great writer remarks, " That the spirit of God seems " to have intended by this appellation, to prevent any " one from thinking that Christ was God, on account " of his great power and dignity. For he that is a " Priest, cannot be the most high God. For it belongs " to a Priest to be a Minister of the Sanctuary, from " which also the very office of Priest-hood, is called a " Ministry. It belongs also to the character of a Priest, " to transact for men with God, to offer to God for " them, to interceed for them, and finally, to appear be- " fore God in their behalf. All which things are very " clear both from the nature of the office itself, and also " from the Epistle to the Hebrews, wherein they are in " general affirmed, partly of Priests, and partly in par- " ticular attributed to Christ himself. But none of these " things are incident to the most high God. For he it " is who hath Priests of different ranks and degrees ; but " is himself Priest of none. To him Ministry and ob- " lation are performed, to him intercession is made for " others ; before his face an appearance is made, for the " forgiveness

“ forgiveness of sins: but he ministers to none. he offers
 “ so none, he intercedes for none, he makes appearance
 “ before the face of none, in order to obtain the remis-
 “ sion of sins. For he by his own sovereign right
 “ and authority, pardons the sins of his creatures.
 “ Now although some things (in the Epistle to the
 “ Hebrews) may be figuratively applied to Christ,
 “ yet this is certain: that these kinds of speak-
 “ ing could by no means be applied to him, if he
 “ was the first and highest cause of the remission of
 “ sins, and forgave them unto men of himself by a power
 “ not received from another, that is, if he were the
 “ most high God. Nor can the pretended distinction
 “ of natures in the least help the Trinitarians in this
 “ respect, any more than in others: for if Christ besides
 “ the human nature, had also a divine one, it would be
 “ necessary, that he no less than the Father, should have
 “ an high-Priest and this Priest be himself; since no
 “ reason can be assigned: that the Father should have
 “ a Priest and Christ have none, if he be God as well
 “ as the Father, yea, the same God in number with
 “ him:—But where is there the least hint in holy
 “ scripture, from whence it can be inferred, that Christ
 “ hath an high-Priest as well as the Father. It is evident
 “ that it is very absurd to imagine, that the person of
 “ Christ offers to himself. Wherefore the Priesthood of
 “ Christ is utterly inconsistent with the divine nature
 “ which is supposed to reside in him.” † This argu-
 ment is perfectly conclusive, and deserves to be attentive-
 ly considered. For if Christ had been God, he could
 never have acted the part of a mediator or intercessor in
 behalf of Mankind. He would (upon this supposition)
 have been the party offended, and consequently, if an in-
 finite satisfaction for sin was at all necessary, he must
 have insisted upon such a satisfaction, as well as the
 Father.

In the Thirteenth place, Jesus Christ is not the most
 high God, because, he exclaimed during his sufferings
 upon

† Crellius de uno Deo patre.

Upon the cross, as Mathew informs us xxvii. 46. " My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me." Upon the Trinitarian scheme, it is absolutely impossible to suppose Jesus to have uttered an exclamation of this kind. How could God leave or forsake Jesus, when he was as they tell us so closely united to him, as to form one person with him. Was the hypostatical union dissolved at this period; or was it quiescent when it had the greatest reason to exert itself. Was this exclamation addressed to the supposed divine nature of Jesus; or was it addressed to the Father. If the former is asserted, it will prove that Jesus was two persons and not one person; and that there was no proper union betwixt the two natures at all. If the latter is admitted, it will follow, that Jesus had no divine nature of his own, because that must have supported him without the assistance of the Father. There is no difficulty in accounting for this upon Unitarian principles. For, although the Father's fulness dwelt in Jesus; yet that fulness formed no necessary part of his being; and he might for a time, and during the agonies of dissolving nature, be deprived of the sensible experience of it.

In the fourteenth place, Jesus Christ is not the most high God; but a dependent inferior being, because, he declares that he had not the disposal of the highest places in his own mediatorial kingdom. Mat. xx. 23. " To sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but (it shall be given to them) for whom it is prepared of my Father." The words inclosed in the parenthesis, are not in the Greek original. But this makes no alteration in the sense of the passage. It is clear from it, that Jesus could not confer these places of honour and dignity; but according to the Father's direction and appointment. And does not this prove in the clearest and most satisfactory manner, the subjection of Jesus to the God and Father of all. Could Jesus be God, and yet not have the absolute direction and government of his own kingdom. It is in vain to say here, as well as in other places, that Jesus speaks according to his human

human nature ; for he refers to no divine nature whatever, but positively asserts that these places were not his to give ; but that he must be guided by the Father in the disposal of them.

In the fifteenth place, Jesus Christ is not the most high God, but altogether dependent upon him and subjected to his authority ; because, he is said in scripture to have a God, a head, or superior ; and to be the possession or property of God. John, xx. 17. " Go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God." Rev. iii. 12. " Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go no more out ; and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, which is new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God, &c." Eph. i. 17. " That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory may give unto you the spirit of wisdom, &c." Heb. i. 9. " Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity ; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." Micah, v. 4. " And he (Christ) shall stand and feed in the strength of the Lord, in the majesty of the name of the Lord his God, &c." 1 Cor. xi. 3. " The head of Christ is God." 1 Cor. iii. 21. 22. 23. " Therefore let no man glory in man : for all things are yours ; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come ; all are yours ; and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's. These texts afford a very clear proof, that proper Godhead does not belong to Jesus Christ. He who has a God, and acknowledges him as such, as our Lord repeatedly does, cannot be God himself. He who stands and feeds in the strength of the Lord his God, wants power and ability to stand by himself. It is a good argument to prove, that christians are subject to Christ, when they are said to be Christ's ; and in consequence of being his to possess every thing else ; and it is equally a good argument to prove, that Christ belongs to and is subject

to God; when he is said to be God's which concludes the grand and magnificent climax of the Apostle. And upon this the hope and security of christians is founded: In consequence of being Christ's they belong to God, and are under the protection and guardianship of his omnipotent arm.

In the sixteenth place, Jesus Christ is not the most high God; but a being inferior to him, and dependent upon him, because it is strongly, repeatedly, and most emphatically affirmed in scripture, that God the Father raised him from the dead. Acts, ii. 24. "Whom (Jesus) God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death." Acts, ii. 32. "This Jesus hath God raised up whereof we all are witnesses." Acts iii. 26. "Unto you first, God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities" Acts, xiii. 32 33 34. "And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto the Fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, thou art my Son this day have I begotten thee. And as concerning that he raised him up from the dead, now no more to return to corruption, he said on this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David." Ver 37. "But, he whom God raised up again saw no corruption," Gal i 1. "Paul an Apostle (not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead:"); &c. Eph. i. 18. 19. 20. That ye may know what is the exceeding greatness of his power (viz the power of God the Father of whom the Apostle had been speaking before) to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power; which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, &c." 1 Thel i. 9 10. Ye turned to God from idols, to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus which delivered us from the wrath to come," Rom. vi. iv. There
fore

fore we are buried with him by baptism unto death : that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Col. ii. 12. "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God : who hath raised him from the dead" Rom. x. 9. "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart, that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." 1 Peter i. 21. "Who by him (that is by Christ) do believe in God that raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory, that your faith and hope might be in God." Christ is also said in scripture to have been quickened by the spirit ; but that only denotes the mighty working of the Father's power, which was employed in effecting his resurrection. We have here a great collection of testimonies from inspired writers, all with one voice declaring, that God, or the Father, raised Christ from the dead. The authors of scripture, have enforced this important truth, with all the variety and energy of expression, and have declared, that if we confess with our mouths the Lord Jesus, and believe this fundamental article concerning him, we shall be saved. They have declared, that he was raised from the dead by the glorious power of the Father ; and that God the Father gave him glory, that our faith and hope might be in God. The resurrection of Christ is represented by them as a pattern of ours ; and we are assured that those that sleep in Jesus, God will bring with him. There are some expressions of our Lord's, that at first sight, and to an inconsiderate reader, might seem to indicate that he effected his resurrection by his own power, John, ii. 19. 21. "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. He spake of the temple of his body." John, x. 18. "No man taketh (my life) from me, but I lay it down of myself : I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father. This last citation explains itself, and the preceding, Christ received from the Father, a command-

ment,

ment, a promise, a certain assurance, that he should be raised from the dead, by the exertion of the Father's glorious and irresistible power. On this account his heart rejoices, his tongue is glad, and his flesh rests in hope. He knew that God would not suffer him to remain in the state of the dead; nor permit his holy one to see corruption, and therefore in his conferences with the Jews, he speaks of his resurrection, as a thing altogether in his own power, because, he knew it must inevitably come to pass. Previous to our Lord's resurrection, an Angel is dispatched from heaven to roll away the stone from his sepulchre, and as it were to usher our great master into the world again; and to congratulate him upon his restoration to life. And this consideration would tend greatly to confirm the notion, that our Lord was quite passive in his own resurrection, it a fact that is so often and so plainly asserted in scripture, stood in need of any confirmation. And did our Lord Jesus Christ die, and was he raised from the dead, by the mighty working of the Father's power? If that was the case, then, it follows plainly and undeniably, that he was not God; nor equal with that God, with whom there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning, whose eternal and unchangeable nature cannot be subject to pain, disease or death! It is a vain and fallacious evasion to talk of the supposed divine nature of Christ in this case. For why is not his resurrection attributed to this divine nature in scripture? Why is it not said that God the Son raised Christ from the dead, as well as God the Father? If such a divine nature had really existed, and had been hypostatically united to Jesus, that nature only, was the proper agent to have raised him from the dead, and there would have been no necessity for the working of the Father's mighty power, whereby he wrought in Christ, and effected his resurrection. It is astonishing, that so many christians with the bible in their hands, do not discover and feel the force of an argument like this. With me it has irresistible weight, and if attentively considered, could not I think fail to produce a like conviction, in the minds of

of others: Now may the God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make us perfect in every good work to do his will, working in us that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever and ever, AMEN.

DISCOURSES ON THE DIVINE UNITY.

DISCOURSE VI.

John Chap. xvii. ver. 3. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

THE proper and personal unity of the supreme being, being a doctrine of the greatest importance in the system of revealed religion, it is highly necessary that the proofs and evidences of it with which the sacred scriptures abound, should be exhibited in their full extent; and that the fallacies and sophistry of those, who pervert and explain away the plain and obvious meaning of the word of God should be detected and exposed; in order if possible to bring back the professors of christianity to the acknowledgement of a truth, from which they have so long and so strangely deviated. There is no part of scripture that affords a fuller proof of this important article, than the words of our text. For which reason at our first entrance upon this subject, we adopted them as the ground-work and basis of our reasoning; and proposed by an appeal to the scriptures at large, to enforce and establish the following propositions, viz.

First, that there is one person, or intelligent agent, who alone is God, supreme, almighty, and eternal: and that this one person is the Father, or as he is sometimes called in scripture, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God.

Secondly, that Jesus Christ is not the most high God; but a being inferior to him, dependent upon him, and acting by his command and authority; or in other words his
Son

Son, Servant, and Messenger, and by the Father's appointment, the Messiah, or only Mediator between God and Man. That they might know Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

And Thirdly and Lastly, to consider and answer the objections, that the Trinitarians make to our hypothesis, and urge in support of their own, founded on various places both of the Old and New Testament.

The first of these propositions has been already fully considered and proved; and the second we have had twice before us, as the subject of our disquisitions. In our fifth discourse, we urged a variety of scriptural arguments, against the notion of Jesus Christ being the most high God. From his having no will of his own, but being always governed and directed by the will of his heavenly Father; from his being sent of God the Father; from his declaring that he could do nothing of himself; but that all his miracles were performed by the Father dwelling in him, or by the Spirit of God; from his receiving commands from God the Father, and giving an unreserved obedience to these commands: from his praying to the Father with earnestness, fervour, and submission; from his being styled the image of the invisible God; from his being called the first born of every creature; and his calling himself the beginning of the creation of God; from his being tempted of the devil; from his being called a priest and a high-priest so often, by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews; from his exclamation during his sufferings upon the cross: from his declaring, that he had not the disposal of the highest places in his own mediatorial kingdom: from his having a God, a head, or superior; and from his being declared to be the possession or property of God; and lastly, from its being so repeatedly and emphatically affirmed in scripture, that he was raised from the dead by God or the Father. We have still some cogent and striking arguments to advance on this part of our subject. But before we produce them, it behoves us to consider more particularly the supposed distinction of
natures,

natures, which the Trinitarians affirm to have been in Jesus Christ; and wherewith they endeavour to invalidate the force of our proofs; and evade the strength of our arguments, which otherwise would be irresistible. It is true, this notion is absurd and contradictory in itself; and in our last discourse we said enough to discredit it, in the judgement of any sensible and considerate person. But as our opponents have recourse to it, on all occasions, as their last refuge, it seems necessary to consider it more distinctly, and to shew that it has no more foundation in scripture than in the nature and reason of things: but is merely an assumed arbitrary hypothesis; a groundless and unwarrantable distinction, invented to support an otherwise indefensible cause; and which is entirely unauthorized by the original records of our religion. Many of the ancients, in the first and second centuries of the christian church, had a different method of considering the nature of man; from what we have at present. They supposed human nature to be divided into three parts, viz. The PNEUMA or NOUS; the spirit or rational and divine part; the PSUCHE; the soul or sensitive part; and the SOMA or SARK, the body, or fleshly part. Justin Martyr makes express mention of these three parts, as does Irenæus, Tatian, and Athenagoras also, and Melito wrote a book concerning the soul, body and spirit which is now lost. There is even a plain allusion to this ancient division of man, in the word of God itself 1 Thes. v. 23. "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit, and soul, and body, be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." The modern division of man is different from this. We do not usually distinguish betwixt the soul and the spirit, as the ancients did; but consider them as one and the same. Human nature according to the modern ideas of it (which most generally prevail) consists only of a material body, or fleshly part; and a soul, or sentient principle, which informs, animates, and governs this body. But although many of the ancients held the beforementioned division of hu-
man

man nature, they were not so absurd as to imagine, that there were two rational or thinking principles in any one man. They considered the spirit, as properly the seat of cogitation or thought; and the other parts as incapable of it. So that this difference betwixt the ancients and moderns in regard to the nature of man, is more a difference in words than in the reality of the thing. The Trinitarians affirm, that our Lord Jesus Christ had the compleat human nature, a body such as ours composed of flesh and blood, and a rational soul like ours also: and that besides these he had the second person of the Trinity, who say they is God the Son equal with the Father, hypostatically or personally united to the human soul: and consequently incarnate in the human body as well as the soul; and that these two natures make one person in Christ. This is the very notion which the Athanasian creed inculcates; and which has been adopted as to the substance of it, by all Trinitarians in general. I shall therefore quote the words of that creed: as giving a just account of the opinion I intend to oppose. "Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation: that he also believe rightly the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the right faith is, that we believe and confess, that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man: God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds: and Man of the substance of his Mother, born in the world; perfect God, and perfect Man, of a reasonable soul, and human flesh subsisting; equal to the Father, as touching his Godhead; and inferior to the Father, as touching his Manhood. Who although he be God and Man: yet he is not two, but one Christ; one; not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh: but by taking of the Manhood into God; one altogether, not by confusion of substance; but by unity of person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man; so God and Man is one Christ." So far the creed commonly tho' erroneously ascribed to Athanasius. The reasoning of this creed may perhaps be admired by those, who

learn their religion by rote; and never think at all upon the consequences of what they affirm. But it requires very little natural logic, to perceive a string of contradictions and inconsistencies following one another in this quotation; and rendering it incapable of belief. "The right faith is (says this unknown writer) that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man; God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds, and Man of the substance of his Mother, born in the world, &c." We have already sufficiently confuted the notion of Jesus Christ being begotten of the Father's essence or substance; and being called the Son of God on that account. We shall now shew, that although such an eternal and consubstantial Son of God equal with the Father really existed; yet, it is utterly impossible, that any hypostatical or personal union, could take place betwixt him and a Man. For no consistent Trinitarian can deny, that the second person of their supposed Trinity, is a real person, or agent, distinct from the Father and the Holy Ghost. Nor can it be fairly denied, that a man consisting of a body, and a soul or intelligent thinking principle, is also a real person or agent. From this state of the case which is a clear and just one, it certainly follows, that our Lord Jesus Christ is two persons, which is the very opinion of Nestorius condemned by the Trinitarians themselves: but unjustly, for it is the natural consequence of their principles. Nor can they escape this difficulty, unless they will affirm with Eutyches, that the human nature was absorbed or swallowed up in the divine; so as to be no longer distinguishable. But the Trinitarians have also condemned this opinion as heretical: and tell us expressly, that our Lord Jesus Christ is both God and Man, in two distinct natures, and one person for ever. They must therefore have recourse in this, as well as in other perplexing difficulties, to their everlasting friend MYSTERY; and covered with this impenetrable shield, they imagine themselves secure from every attack. But by maintaining this

this absurd opinion which they are unable to defend, they confound all the natures and distinctions of things, and introduce a total confusion into our ideas; and in pursuing this argument, we can reduce them to the necessity of affirming, that the human soul and body of our Lord Jesus Christ did not constitute a person in him, although it does so in every individual Man and Woman, that is born into the world besides. But to return to the creed we have quoted. The author proceeds to affirm speaking of Christ. "Who although he
 "be God and Man: yet he is not two, but one Christ;
 "One; not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh: but
 "by taking of the Manhood into God; One altogether;
 "not by confusion of substance: but by unity of person.
 "For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man: so God
 "and Man is one Christ." The author here attempts to account for the supposed union of the divine and human natures in Jesus Christ; by comparing it to the union of the soul and body. But this is not a just and fair comparison. For the union of a soul with a body, (according to the common theory of human nature) is only an union betwixt two finite things; (very different and opposite indeed but still finite) which may be supposed to take place by the power of God; and to be preserved and continued by his perpetual agency. But a personal union betwixt God and man, is an union or conjunction betwixt what is finite and infinite; which cannot be admitted. It is supposing either, that the immense, the eternal, the transcendent Deity; is made commensurate to a human soul: or that a human soul is elevated to the height of Deity. It is supposing he that filleth heaven and earth with his presence, whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain; and in whom we all live, move and have our being, to have been incarnate or cased in a human body. For if the Trinitarians deny this absurd and impossible supposition, it is in vain to talk of an incarnation; or a personal union, and their cause is utterly lost. If they admit it, the following monstrous consequences will follow; that a supreme infinite person or agent

agent for a time (if not for ever) ceased to be so: that laying aside his divine attributes and heavenly glories, he conveyed himself into a Virgin's womb, and was born or brought forth as other infants are: that Mary was the mother of God: that the supreme being was once a weak tender and helpless child, suckled at the breast, dandled on the knees, nourished, fed and brought up by the care; and carried about in the arms of a woman: that the supreme being increased in wisdom and stature; and in favour with God and Man: that he applied himself to a carpenter's Trade, under the direction of his supposed Father until he was thirty years of age: that then he was anointed with the Spirit without measure, entered upon his Ministry, and performed many miracles, and delivered many doctrines to Mankind: that he met with much trouble, affliction, and opposition in the world; and at last ended his days on the cross; that the God of nature died, and was buried, and was raised again from the dead and highly rewarded and exalted in heaven, by another God or divine person equal to himself, What shocking Ideas are these! Does not every considerate person feel his mind recoil at the perusal of them? Yet there is nothing forced or exaggerated in this picture. It is the natural consequences of a real and proper Incarnation of the Deity. And if the Trinitarians deny this to be a just representation of their opinion; and pretend that notwithstanding the personal union, their second divine person still retained the proper attributes of Deity; and that God is said to be man and man to be God only by a communication of Idioms; that is figuratively and improperly, then, the whole business of the Incarnation will vanish into a figure of speech; and Jesus Christ will not be God upon their scheme, any more than he is to upon the Unitarian. He will only be a creature, guided, directed, influenced and inspired, by God the Son, in the same manner as the Unitarians suppose him to be, by God the Father. And thus the Trinitarians will be found to have broken the first commandment, and to have made more Gods than one, with-

out

out even gaining their favourite point of making Jesus Christ to be God. But again the Athanasian comparison of the union of the two natures in Jesus Christ, to that of the soul and body in man, will be found to be defective in another respect. For as an Unitarian writer justly observes, "The union of the soul and body may be properly personal, that is, may constitute or make one person; because it is not the union of two persons, but only of one person (the soul) to a thing otherwise without life, reason, memory or free will. The body is but as it were the garment of the soul, and is wholly acted by it, and depending on it. But in the pretended union of God with Man, there are two distinct and very different lives, reasons, memories, and free wills: which utterly destroy a personal union; for that supposes but one life, one reason, one memory, one free-will: for if these things which constitute a person; are found more than once, there is no longer one person, but two, and consequently no personal union in the sense of which we are speaking." § There is another absurdity, which it may be proper here to take notice of, that attends the belief of God the Son the second person of the Trinity being incarnate, (according to the system of our opponents) and that is derived from their very notion of the Trinity itself. The Fa-
ther

§ An eminent prelate, whose excellent moral sermons I admire; but whose speculative principles I cannot adopt, has endeavoured to elucidate the supposed existence of the two natures in Jesus Christ, by comparing it to the union of the body and soul, in like manner as the Athanasian creed does. But the considerations and arguments suggested above are sufficient to refute what he has advanced. How unworthy is it of so great a man, to betake himself to the stale device of mystery on the subject of the incarnation: a refuge which he will not allow to the Roman Catholics; but which they have an equal right to claim, on the subject of transubstantiation. See Abp. Tillotson's sermons on the Trinity and Incarnation.

ther, Son, and Holy Ghost, are (say they) three persons, all existing together in one individual or numerical essence; which is incapable of division or separation. And yet notwithstanding they affirm with amazing inconsistency, that one of these persons, viz. the second was incarnate, while the first and third were not. Now nothing can be plainer or more certain, than that if the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost have the same numerical essence; that either all the three must have been incarnate or none of them possibly could be so. This is an argument that lies open to every one's capacity, who will but open his eyes and acknowledge the force of truth and not suffer himself to be deluded, and estranged from the simplicity of the faith, by giving a blind and implicit assent to chimerical schemes of religion. The force of this argument was so great, as to drive one Trinitarian to the necessity of affirming, that the whole Trinity was incarnate in Jesus Christ; and has obliged others who were inclined to adopt the modal or sabellian system, to be inconsistent with themselves, and to turn Fritheists in speaking of the incarnation.

In regard to scripture evidence for the existence of two natures in Jesus Christ, the Trinitarians can produce nothing that is at all to the purpose. Our Lord speaks of himself, and the scriptures uniformly describe him, as one single mind or agent, acting in perfect obedience to the commands of his heavenly Father and delighting to do his will. He is described as one who possessed the Father's fulness, or the communication of the spirit without measure; which qualifications render the supposition of a distinct and separate divine nature quite unnecessary; and in my opinion fully prove that no such divine nature did or could exist in him. Whereas if our Lord had had a divine nature of his own, separate from that of the Father, the thing no doubt would have been asserted with the greatest clearness in scripture, and made so palpably evident, that it could not have been misunderstood. The Trinitarians sometimes quote texts such as these, in support of their schema. Acts ii. 30.

Therefore

“ Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ, to sit on his throne, &c.” Rom. ix. 5 “ Whole are the Fathers, and of whom concerning the flesh Christ came.” Rom i 3. 4. “ Made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power : according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead.” Our opponents understand by the phrase, according to the flesh, according to human nature, and would infer from it that Jesus Christ had another and a divine nature. But this inference will appear to be ill grounded, if we consider those passages of scripture wherein the same phrase is used and applied to persons, whom we are very sure possessed no more than one nature. In Rom. iv. 1. we read of “ Abraham our Father as pertaining to the flesh.” Rom ix. 3 Paul speaking of the Jews says; they were his kinsmen according to the flesh, and in 1 Cor. x. 18. we are told of Israel after the flesh. The Greek words *KATA SAKKA* occur in all these quotations; and are sometimes rendered according to, and at other times after or pertaining to the flesh: and the true meaning of the expression is not, according to human nature; but according to carnal descent. The Jews were St Paul’s kinsmen according to carnal descent, but they were not his spiritual religious kinsmen. In like manner Jesus Christ was of the Jews, and descended from David in regard to the flesh he took of the Virgin; but with respect to his origination by the power of God, and his consecration to the Messiahship by the effusion of the spirit, he is to be considered as the Son of God, and of a heavenly extraction and original; and was more fully constituted in this office, and acquired a new title to it by his resurrection from the dead. This passage of the apostle John i. 14. “ The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us ” is also sometimes used as an argument, to prove the existence of two natures in Christ. But the Apostle’s words convey no such idea. For if the *Logos* or word here mentioned

means

means a person, they only denote that that person assumed flesh or a body, and became himself the soul of it; and if it does not mean a person, but an attribute or property, they signify that the Reason or wisdom of the Father dwelt in Jesus Christ. Both these interpretations are equally hostile to the scheme of two natures; and one of them must be the sense of the passage. We shall now sum up all we have said concerning this erroneous system, in the emphatical words of an eminent advocate for the cause of truth. "It is a thing in itself utterly impossible, that a being should be God and Man; creator and creature; self-existent, eternal, independent, and limited, dependent, and having beginning of existence, at the same time; omniscient and omnipotent, and yet ignorant and weak. These things are not compatible; we should be shocked at their absurdity, if they were not instilled into us before we begin to make use of our reason, and if many were not afterwards afraid to make use of it about them; suffering themselves to be dazzled by great names and authorities, and imposed upon by high antiquity, which can give no prescription to what is unintelligible and impossible. In short, this doctrine of Christ being possessed of two natures, is the fiction of ingenious men, determined at all events to believe Christ to be a different being from what he really was, and uniformly declared himself to be; by which they solve such difficulties of scripture as they cannot otherwise get over, and endeavour to prove him to be the most high God, in spite of his own most express and constant declarations to the contrary. And as there is no reasoning, with such persons, they are to be considered and pitied, as being under a debility of mind in this respect, however sensible and rational in all others." †

Put to return from this long digression concerning these supposed two natures. Jesus Christ is not the most high God; or God in the proper and sublime sense of that word, because, he wants the perfection of supreme

and

† Mr Lindsey's Catechist, page 27

and absolute goodness which is essential to the Deity: Mat. xix, 16. 17. " And behold, one came and said unto him good master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life. And he said unto him, why callest thou me good? There is none good but one that is God." Here we find our Saviour, although a person of the most amiable and spotless character, refusing the title of good master. It may seem strange at first, that our Lord should reject an appellation of this kind. The person who gave it, probably intended nothing more by it, but a friendly salutation, in testimony of his reverence and respect for our Saviour's person and eminent worth. But Jesus who sought not his own glory, but the glory of him that sent him declares, that there is none good but one, that is God. He was sensible that pure unmixed goodness in the highest perfection, could only reside in the supreme being, who alone is sovereignly and completely so; and therefore ascribes the glory of this attribute to him only, in its full extent. This strongly indicates to us, that Jesus is not to be considered as God, or equal with that God, who is good unto all, and whose tender mercies are over all his works. For in that case, why should he refuse a title that justly belonged to him in the highest sense? Some Trinitarians have endeavoured to give a strange turn to these words of Christ; as if he intended by them to ask the person who addressed him, " seeing you do not take me for God as I really am, and possessing goodness in the highest degree, why do you call me good master at all." But there is nothing in the context to warrant such a conjecture. For our Lord declares, that there is none good but (HET as it is in the Greek) one person, that is God; which one person can be no other than the Father, who alone is the one God of Christians. But if Christ is God, it would not be true that one person alone is supremely good; since two or more persons would have an equal claim to this attribute. Many attempts have been made by our opponents, by forced and unnatural criticisms, to explain away the obvious meaning of our Lord's words

in this passage; as if they might be rendered from the original thus. There is none good but God only, or there is none good *ΕΙ ΜΕ ΗΕΙΣ ΗΟ ΓΗΕΟΣ* but the one God. But although this translation would do no hurt to our cause; and could not serve that of our opponents in the least: (for the one God is the Father as we have fully proved;) yet it is necessary to observe that it is not agreeable to the genius of the Greek language to transpose the words as they are above; and to place the article between the adjective and the substantive; and so this translation cannot be admitted. Upon the whole it is abundantly clear, that this glorious attribute of boundless and unlimited goodness, does not belong to our Lord Jesus Christ; and that therefore he must be essentially different from that most high God, in whose nature it resides, and who in consequence of it imparts joy and happiness to the whole creation.

In the eighteenth place, Jesus Christ is not the most high God; or the supreme, omnipotent being, because, he declares in express and positive terms, that there is one greater than himself. John xiv. 28. "Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you. If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: for my Father is greater than I." Now we are perfectly sure that none can be greater than God: who is the most glorious and perfect of all beings, and can have no equal, far less a superior. The very heavens styled their supreme Jupiter, *Deus optimus maximus*, God the best and the greatest of beings; and describe the Deity as one, *quo nec melius, nec majus concipi potest*, than whom it is impossible to conceive, a greater, or a better. But our Lord Jesus Christ has given up all pretensions to the character of supreme and absolute greatness. He informed his Disciples, that the Father was greater than himself; and that if they truly loved him, it would be matter of joy to them to hear of his going to the Father; in order to receive greater degrees of happiness, than what he possessed while he

he remained in their company on earth. This single declaration of our Lord's, is sufficient alone to establish the Unitarian doctrine on a solid foundation; and taken in connection with our other numerous proofs and arguments; it is irresistibly strong and convincing. It is a poor evasion to say, that Jesus Christ speaks here according to his human nature: but that he was notwithstanding equal to the Father in his divine nature. We have before shewn, that there is no evidence for the existence of these two supposed natures in Christ; and therefore there is no room for a subterfuge of this kind. But even supposing for a moment, that two such natures had existed: yet as they are said to form one person in Christ, the Pronoun I includes them both; and proves that Christ was inferior in both natures to the Father. For it is intolerable prevarication in our adversaries to affirm, that Christ speaks sometimes according to his supposed divine, sometimes according to his human nature; and at other times according to both natures. This is turning the sacred scriptures into a riddle, shifting and changing the person of Christ in order to serve a turn; and by the use of similar distinctions, all human language may be rendered precarious and uncertain; and no certain criterion will be left for distinguishing truth from error.

In the nineteenth place, Jesus Christ is not the most high God; the only wise and omniscient Deity: but a being inferior to him, and dependent upon him, because, he declares in the most solemn manner, that he was ignorant of the precise time of the day of Judgement. Math. xxiv. 36. "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only." Mark xiii. 32. "But of that day, and that hour, knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." That God knows the day of Judgement we are absolutely certain, because, the Apostle Paul informs us. Acts, xvii. 31. that "he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained;

ordained; " and in Acts, xv. 18, we are told that, " Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world. In Isaiah, xli. 21, 22, 23, the true God is eminently distinguished from the false ones by his knowledge of future events. " Produce your cause, saith the Lord; bring forth your strong reasons saith the King of Jacob. Let them bring them forth, and shew us what shall happen: let them shew the former things what they be, that we may consider them, and know the latter end of them; or declare us things for to come. Shew us things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that ye are Gods; yea do good or do evil, that we may be dismayed, and behold it together." Now it is a certain fact, that our Lord Jesus Christ was while upon earth ignorant of the day of Judgement; and therefore he cannot be that God, to whom all futurity is open; and who knows every thing that is possible to be known. It is hardly possible to conceive words more strongly and clearly expressed; and better guarded against all exception, than what our Lord makes use of in Mark. " But of that day, and that hour knoweth (Gr. OUDEIS) none; no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, † but the Father;" and Matthew adds,

† (Neither the Son) Bp. Pearce observes upon this clause of the verse as follows, " Ambrose in his treatise " De Fide V. 7. says, *veteres non habent codices, quod " nec filius scit*: which is the same as to say, that the " OUDE HO HUIOS were not found in ancient Greek " Mss. of his days, in those at least, which he had seen; " but at present they are found in all of them. For " the reasons given in note on Matthew xxiv 36. we " ought not (I think) to suppose, that Jesus was ignorant of this particular: and therefore I am inclinable " to believe, that these words were not originally inserted by Mark, &c." † But although these words could be set aside, the expression, " my Father only," which St Matthew records, would alone prove that Christ was ignorant

† Bp. Pearce in Loco.

adds, "ΕΙ ΜΕ ΗΟ ΡΑΤΕΡ ΜΟΥ ΜΟΝΟΣ, but my Father only," which gives additional strength to the assertion of our Lord. Yet plain and express as these words are, many unavailing attempts have been made by Trinitarian writers to prove; that Jesus really knew the day of judgement, at the very time that he asserted the contrary to his disciples. An eminent writer in defence of the divine unity, and also a confessor for this glorious cause, has so well exposed the fallacies of our opponents upon this subject; that it would be doing an injury to the cause of truth, not to insert what he has advanced upon it. I shall therefore make no apology, for introducing a long and valuable quotation from him into this discourse. It is to be observed, that the author argues sometimes *AD HOMINEM*: that is to say, upon the principles of his adversaries, and proves even that the consequences will not follow, although the premises be admitted. "What can be said against these plain arguments? I imagine our opposers have but one shift left for the evading them, and that is a distinction which serves them in all cases; for they say Jesus Christ speaks these things of himself, as man only, while he had another nature as God, which he reserved

ignorant of the day of judgement. At the same time it deserves to be remarked, that the single authority of Ambrose is no sufficient reason, for setting aside these words in St Mark. Ambrose might be mistaken, and there is good reason to think that he was so; because, all the Greek Mss, that have come down to the present times and have been collated, acknowledge this passage; as may be seen in Mill, Kuster, and Wettstein; and besides it is quoted by Irenæus who lived long before Ambrose; and by Athanasius, Epiphanius, and other ancient writers. Bp. Pearce's attempts to explain this passage, agreeably to the common and received system of orthodoxy, is only doing unnatural violence to the plain meaning of our Lord's words. Jesus might know the circumstances preceding and attending the day of judgement

“ ved, and excepted out of the case : so that when he
 “ says, I cannot do thus myself, or I am not to be call-
 “ ed the chief good, or do not know this, &c. ac-
 “ cording to them the meaning is, I have not these per-
 “ fections in my human nature; but yet I know and
 “ can do all unassisted, and am the chief good in my
 “ divine nature, which also is more properly myself.
 “ The vanity of which subterfuge, I intend now to
 “ lay open, by shewing how absurdly this distinction
 “ of the two natures is pretended, to take off the
 “ force of such expressions from Christ's own mouth,
 “ which in their natural and undisguised appearance do
 “ proclaim his inferiority to God, even the Father. And
 “ I shall dwell the more upon this, because it is the most
 “ popular and common evasion, and comes in at every
 “ turn, when all other relief fails. It would be no un-
 “ reasonable demand to ask, what intimation of any such
 “ distinction of two natures they can point us to, in
 “ any of these discourses of Christ. Why should men
 “ devise or imagine for him such a strange, and seeming-
 “ ly deceitful way of speaking from no ground, nor
 “ necessity, other than that of upholding their own pre-
 “ carious opinion? But I have several remarks to make
 “ upon this common answer

“ 1 That which in the first place I have to object
 “ against it is, that our blessed Lord Jesus Christ, if him-
 “ self was the supreme God in any nature of his own,

could
 ment, without knowing the precise day and hour when
 that event should happen. And tho' all things are said
 be delivered to Christ of the Father; yet these general
 expressions, admit of exceptions: for christians are said
 to have an unction from the holy one, and to know all
 things; and the knowledge of the day of judgement is
 particularly excepted by our Lord himself. The par-
 able where our Lord is represented, as coming in an hour
 when the servant looketh not for him, and is not aware
 of, is not to the purpose. Our Lord might know that
 he should come unexpectedly upon many; although he
 did not know the precise time of his coming.

“ could not have said such things, as I conceive, in any
 “ consistency with truth and sincerity, (which he always
 “ maintained strictly) he could not say himself could not
 “ do, or did not know the thing, which all this while
 “ himself could do, and did know very well, as to be
 “ sure if he was the supreme God, he could and did;
 “ for this were to make him say what is most false, and
 “ to equivocate in the most deceitful manner: for tho’
 “ we should suppose he consisted of two infinitely dis-
 “ tant natures, and so had two capacities of knowledge,
 “ &c. Yet since himself includes them both, it follows,
 “ that the denying a thing of himself in absolute terms,
 “ without any limitation in the words or other obvious
 “ circumstances, does plainly imply a denial of its be-
 “ longing to any part of his person, or any nature in
 “ it. For tho’ we may affirm a thing of a person which
 “ belongs only to a part of him; as I may properly say
 “ a man is wounded or hurt, tho’ it be only in one mem-
 “ ber, suppose an arm: yet I cannot say a man is not
 “ wounded, because tho’ one arm be shot or wounded,
 “ yet the other is whole.”

“ For instance, I have two organs of sight, two eyes.
 “ Now suppose I converse with a man with one eye
 “ shut and the other open; if being asked whether I
 “ saw him, I should dare to say I saw him not (with-
 “ out any limitation) meaning to myself, that I saw
 “ him not with the eye which was shut, tho’ still I saw
 “ him well enough with the eye which was open;
 “ I fear I should bear the reproach of a liar and de-
 “ ceiver, notwithstanding such a mental reservation as
 “ some would attribute to the holy Jesus. For know-
 “ ledge is the eye of the person; Jesus Christ is sup-
 “ posed to have two of these knowing capacities; the
 “ one weak, the other strong and piercing, that dis-
 “ cerns all things. Now as such an one, the disciples
 “ repair to him and ask him, when the end of the world
 “ and time of his coming shall be. He answers them,
 “ by giving them some general account of the matter,
 “ but says that the particular day and hour he knew
 “ not

“ not, nor did any know but the Father, meaning (say
 “ my opposers) that he knew it not with his human
 “ knowledge, tho’ he knew it well enough with his divine;
 “ at the same time that he said the Son knows it not,
 “ absolutely and indefinitely. And yet if Jesus Christ
 “ had a divine knowledge and nature, no doubt his
 “ disciples (who if any body, must be supposed to believe
 “ it) directed the question to that, rather than to the
 “ imperfect human capacity; and yet in answer to it
 “ he says, he knew not the day, which would not be
 “ counted sincerity or truth in men, much less was Jesus
 “ Christ in danger of it, in his mouth no guile was;
 “ let us not impute it to him. That you may see this
 “ is fair reasoning hear how some of the other side own
 “ it, when out of the heat of this controversy. See Dr.
 “ Stillingfleet’s sermon on Math. x. 16. speaking of the
 “ equivocations of popish priests, whose common an-
 “ swer, when examined about what they have known by
 “ confession, is, that they know it not, which they think
 “ to vindicate from the charge of lying by saying, that
 “ in confession, the Priest knows matters as God, not
 “ as man, and therefore he denies to know them, mean-
 “ ing it as man. But says the Doctor, this is absurd;
 “ because to say he does not know, is as much as to say
 “ he doth not any way know. Now if this be a good
 “ answer against the papists, as no doubt it is; then sure
 “ it is so in the present case. Therefore when Christ
 “ says he knows not the day of Judgement, it is as much
 “ as to say he does not any way know it, and consequent-
 “ ly, it is a vain shift to say, it was as man only: we
 “ must beware lest we bring the holy Jesus under such
 “ a reproach for equivocation, as the Romish Priests lie
 “ under; and make the Jesuits themselves think they
 “ have a good title to that name, by imitating herein
 “ his example, which in this very instance they alledge
 “ with so great advantage, according to this inter-
 “ pretation.”

“ 2. As a farther evidence, that Jesus Christ intended
 “ no such distinction of two natures, as is pretended; it
 “ is

“ is to be observed, that he puts not the distinction, or
 “ opposition between the Son of Man, and the eternal
 “ Word (as some speak) but between the Son and his
 “ Father: not the Son knows, but only the Father; by
 “ which it is plain, he had no thought of including any
 “ person or nature of his own among the excepted: for
 “ whatever was not the Father, he says was ignorant of
 “ that day. Now it is certain, that in no nature was
 “ the Son the Father; and consequently where none
 “ but the Father knows, none who is not the Father,
 “ can be intended; and since our Lord was making an
 “ exception in the case, he would not have forgotten to
 “ except the eternal Word too, if there had been such a
 “ divine principle in himself, equal to the Father and
 “ distinct from him; for it is a known rule, that an ex-
 “ ception from a general assertion, confirms it as to
 “ other instances not excepted. Will they say, that by
 “ the Father is meant all the three persons here, viz.
 “ Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? What! can the Fa-
 “ ther as opposed to the Son, be put for the Father and
 “ the Son? What woful work will this make with scrip-
 “ ture, to suppose that what are opposed to each other
 “ do include each other, under the very characters by
 “ which they are opposed? As well may they say that
 “ in the baptismal form, by the Father is meant, Father,
 “ Son, and Spirit, tho’ he be distinguished from the o-
 “ ther two. And I should despair of ever understanding
 “ the scriptures above all books that ever were written,
 “ at this rate of interpretation. No doubt therefore, but
 “ the Father, as opposed to the Son, excludes all that
 “ is the Son; and then there could be no Son of God
 “ that knew of that day which only the Father knew of,
 “ and consequently no Son that is God equal to the
 “ Father

“ 3. Moreover, that interpretation must needs be un-
 “ just, which, if admitted, will make all, even the most
 “ plain speech, uncertain, and utterly insignificant; as
 “ this interpretation of Christ’s words would do. For
 “ as I ask the patrons of this opinion, in what words

“ Jesus Christ could in brief have denied himself to be
 “ God most high, more plain and full than these in which
 “ he says, he knew not all things as the Father did, nor
 “ could do all things, &c. So I would fain have them
 “ shew me, what words of that nature he could have
 “ used, which the same way of interpretation, as they
 “ here use, will not evade and make insignificant. For
 “ had he said, or sworn in plain words thus, viz. I tell
 “ you I am not the supreme God, and none but my Fa-
 “ ther has that glory; they would upon the same rea-
 “ son still have said, this was to be understood of him as
 “ man only. So that no words professing himself not
 “ to be God, could be a proof it, if this way of inter-
 “ pretation be allowed. I may therefore safely say thus
 “ much, that the blessed Jesus has declared himself not
 “ to be the supreme God, or equal to the Father, as
 “ plainly as words could speak, or in brief express; and
 “ that this declaration made by him already, is not to be
 “ evaded any other way, than what will make it impos-
 “ sible his mind should be understood by any words he
 “ could have designedly used in the matter. Let any
 “ one try if this do not hold true: and sure it must be
 “ an absurd way of interpretation, which leaves a man
 “ no opportunity or power of speaking his mind plainly,
 “ so as to be understood.

“ 4. Again, this way of interpretation, which the ad-
 “ vocates of the opinion I oppose are so much necessitat-
 “ ed to for upholding their cause, does plainly overthrow
 “ it again, and may be turned against themselves: for if it be
 “ just and true to deny of Christ absolutely what belongs
 “ to him in one nature, because there is another nature
 “ in which it belongs not to him; then, since to be the
 “ chief God belongs to him (according to our adver-
 “ saries) only in one nature, and not in respect of the o-
 “ ther, or human nature, it follows that it may as justly
 “ be said Jesus Christ is not God, nor to be worshipped
 “ or trusted as such; nay, that he was not before the
 “ Virgin Mary, according to them, and the like; and
 “ this without adding any limitation or restriction any
 more

“ more than our Lord does in the place mentioned.
 “ What would they say to one who should speak or
 “ preach so, that Jesus is not God, that he cannot do
 “ all things, nor is equal to the Father &c? Would
 “ they not conclude he was a denier of the Deity of
 “ Christ, else he never would speak so unguardedly?
 “ Upon the same account, when Jesus Christ himself
 “ says, that he cannot of himself do all things, nor
 “ knows all things, and makes no reserves in his
 “ words, we may conclude he also denies his being
 “ supreme God; else, if it be a just way of speak-
 “ ing in him, it cannot be unjust in us to imitate him,
 “ by denying him indefinitely to be, what he in any one
 “ nature is not, i. e. that he is not God, without adding
 “ more. Nay, after this way of speaking which they
 “ attribute to Christ, a man may be taught to say his
 “ creed backward, and yet make a true profession of his
 “ faith, by denying of Jesus Christ in absolute expres-
 “ sions, whatever may be denied of one of his natures.
 “ I have since the Apostle’s creed takes notice of nothing
 “ to be believed concerning Christ, but what belongs to
 “ his manhood (which is strange, if there were any
 “ articles relating to his supreme Deity, which must be
 “ most important) one may venture to deny them all,
 “ with this secret unexpressed reserve, viz. meaning it
 “ of the divine nature (to which they belong not.) So
 “ that one may say, I believe that Jesus Christ was not
 “ conceived of the Holy Ghost, or born of the Virgin
 “ Mary; I believe that he never was crucified under
 “ Pontius Pilate, nor was dead or buried; that he ne-
 “ ver rose nor ascended, nor will return visibly again;
 “ for his divine nature (which it is pretended he had)
 “ was not capable of these things. And since they say,
 “ the personality is divine, here seems more warrant to
 “ be bolder in denying indefinitely of the person what
 “ belongs not to the divine nature, whose the personality
 “ is, than in so denying of the person what only belongs
 “ not to the human nature; as this interpretation makes
 “ Christ to do.”

“ 5. Finally,

“ 5. Finally, it weighs something with me, in oppo-
 “ sition to this way of interpretation, that the Evange-
 “ lists never take any occasion (when they had so many)
 “ to subjoin any caution against taking Christ’s words in
 “ their obvious sense, when he says, he did not know the
 “ hour, &c, and the like. If, as we said, our Lord had
 “ no mind to reveal his divinity, (tho’ I see not still why
 “ he should deny it thus) yet sure his Apostles, who
 “ wrote so many years after, whom it concerned to re-
 “ veal all important truths most clearly, would not fail
 “ to have set the reader right, by removing such obvi-
 “ ous objections as these are against the supreme Deity
 “ of Christ; and saying he spake this only in respect
 “ of his manhood, that he knew not all things &c.
 “ But here is not one caution given, as often we find
 “ there was about less matters. No doubt it was be-
 “ cause they would have the thing understood as it fairly
 “ lies, not thinking of any such secret reserve in Christ,
 “ of a divine nature in his person to be tacitly excepted,
 “ when he had denied such perfections of his person in-
 “ definitely.” † This ingenious and penetrating writer,
 has investigated so clearly, and so fully confuted, the so-
 phistry of our opponents upon this part of the subject;
 that it would be only multiplying words to no purpose,
 to pursue it farther: and every fair and candid reasoner
 must join in the conclusion; that our Lord Jesus Christ
 is a being far inferior to that God and Father of all; who
 hath put the times and seasons in his own power; ‡ and
 who did not think fit to reveal even to his well-beloved son
 during his residence in earth, the knowledge of this aw-
 ful and important event:

But in the Twentieth and last place, Jesus Christ is
 not the most high God; or the supreme, eternal and un-
 changable Deity; but a being altogether dependent
 upon him, and inferior to him, because, he shall at the
 consummation of all things, deliver up the Kingdom to
 the Father, and shall himself be subject that God may be
 all

† Mr, Emlyn’s Works 4th. Edition Lond. 1746.

‡ Acts i. 7.

all in all. 1 Cor. xv 24 to 28. " Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the Kingdom to God even the Father ; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." This passage carries irresistible weight and efficacy in it, and strongly confirms all our former reasonings and conclusions, and therefore we have reserved it to the last, in order to close the series of our arguments with energy and propriety. In many places of Scripture we are told, that Christ owes all his power, dominion, and dignity, to the free and voluntary gift of God the Father. It was the Father that raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places. It was the Father that gave him glory that our faith and hope might be in God. It was the Father that gave him a name that is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, of things in earth, and of things under the earth ; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. It was the Father to whom it pleased, that in him all fulness should dwell. It is the same great and glorious being that is here described, as having put all things under him ; and who is himself excepted from the number ; because it is impossible that he can be subjected to any power whatever ; who is the original source of all authority. Jesus Christ reigns over this delegated kingdom, that is assigned him by the Father. He reigns but imperfectly at present. His kingdom comprizes but a part of the Globe. His nominal and professed subjects are not a majority of mankind ; and his real and sincere followers are still fewer. But he shall reign more fully and completely in

in the sequel. Aided and assisted by the power of God, his kingdom of truth and righteousness shall prevail; and break in pieces like a potter's vessel every opposing force. The kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our God, and of his Christ; and all his enemies shall be subdued under his feet. Death itself which has reigned from Adam to Moses, and from Moses throughout every period of time; and from whose sway Christ himself was not exempted, shall at last be destroyed; and joy and immortality shall take place of pain and misery. And then, when the great purposes for which this mediatorial kingdom was erected shall have been accomplished; Christ shall resign all his delegated power into the hand of that great being from whom he received it: and shall become the willing subject of his Father and his God. As a General resigns his commission to his sovereign, when the ends for which it was granted are obtained; or as a Viceroy when recalled ceases to govern any longer; in like manner Christ shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even THE FATHER; that God may be all in all. Then the Lord God omnipotent shall reign; and the supreme being shall appear more openly and conspicuously in the government of the moral world, than he does at present. To a candid and unprejudiced mind, unperverted by any attachment to a theological system; I should think, this passage would afford the fullest conviction. When Christ is described, as having all things put under him and subdued unto him by another, when we are informed, that all this power and authority shall be returned back again to the original Donor, even to the Father; and that the Son himself shall be subjected to him. What farther evidence can we expect or desire; for the truth and certainty of the Unitarian doctrine. Is not this fully sufficient to ascertain the Father's sole and supreme Godhead. Does not this fully prove that our Lord Jesus Christ is absolutely dependent upon him, and is only to be considered, as one of the most illustrious and dignified of those beings that he has produced. He who receives power and authority from another for a
certain

certain period; and must in the end return all that power and authority back again, can never be conceived to be God, or equal with that God: whose dominion is eternal, who gives to all, but can receive from none; and who possesses all power, naturally, inherently, and independently in himself. Our adversaries however, who make use of all expedients to support their tottering system, have endeavoured by means of their fallacious and jesuitical distinctions; even to obscure the clearness of this very passage. They tell us that it is the divine nature of Christ, that subdues all things unto him; and that when he resigns the kingdom, he only as it were puts off his mediatorial character; and delivers up his power to his own divine nature, in conjunction with the Father and the Holy Ghost; or in other words to the whole Trinity. But this is one of the wildest and most unwarrantable perversions of the plain meaning of the word of God, that can be imagined; and is even inconsistent with the Trinitarian system itself. For although Christ is said, Phil ii 21. "To change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself:" yet we are assured that he received this power from the Father. For in John's Gospel, v, 26. Christ tells us that, "as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." This working then, is not caused by any divine nature of his own; but by the power of the Father communicated to him, and acting by him. And it is not said that he shall deliver up the kingdom to his own divine nature; or to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: but it is expressly affirmed on the contrary; that he shall deliver it to God even the FATHER. As he was the original bestower of this power, so he is the SOLE RECEIVER of it, and the Son in the full latitude and extent of the term becomes subject to him; and God or the Father is all in all. The Father then will appear directly to his creatures, in his natural, sovereign, and independent character; and all inferior authority, delegated power,

and

and mediation shall cease. But farther the Trinitarian explication, or rather perversion of this passage, is inconsistent with their own scheme in two respects. For as they affirm, that the two natures make one person in Christ; and that this personal union shall continue for ever, it is impossible to conceive, how the human nature of Christ can resign the Kingdom to the divine. While this union continues, whatever belongs to the divine nature must also belong to the human: for a person cannot be separated and divided into parts; nor possess a thing and be deprived of it at the same time. Again, upon their scheme it would not be true, that Christ would become more subjected in consequence of his delivering up his mediatorial kingdom. For they suppose that his becoming mediator, was a departure from his original dignity; and consequently it is evident, that if he should lay aside this assumed character, and appear in the full lustre of his supposed Deity, he would be the Father's equal instead of being subjected to him in any degree. But this final subjection of Christ to the Father, is perfectly suitable to the nature of things upon the Unitarian hypothesis. For our Saviour being originally a dependent being, produced by the power and will of the Almighty; and exalted to an illustrious and dignified station; in order to serve a grand and important purpose in providence; it is highly proper that he should resign this station, when the purposes for which he was appointed to it are answered; and when his continuance in it is no longer necessary; although we must always suppose, that he will for ever possess a reward, suitable to his distinguished merit and obedience.

We have now my brethren produced all the proofs and evidences that we think it necessary to alledge, in support of our second proposition; and I may venture to say, that we have now fully proved, "that Jesus Christ is not the most high God; but a being inferior to him, dependent upon him, and acting by his command and authority; or in other words his Son, Servant, and Messenger;

fenger ; and by the Father's appointment the Messiah, or
 only Mediator between God and Man." A being who
 is expressly distinguished from God ; who is his Son in
 the Scriptural senses of the word ; who has no will of his
 own ; who is sent by God the Father ; who can do no-
 thing of himself ; who receives commands from the Fa-
 ther and gives obedience to them ; who prays to the Fa-
 ther ; who is the image of the invisible God ; who is the
 first born of every creature ; who is a Priest ; who ex-
 claimed during his sufferings that God had forsaken him ;
 who has not the disposal of the highest places in his own
 kingdom ; who acknowledges a God, a head, or superior,
 and is the property of God ; who died and was raised
 from the dead by the Father ; who declares that he was
 not the best and greatest of beings, but that there was
 one greater, and better than himself ; who was ignorant
 of the day of Judgement ; and who shall at last deliver
 up the Kingdom to the Father, and become subject to
 him — It is evident I say, that such a being cannot be
 the most high God ; nor equal to the Lord of heaven and
 earth, to whom these things are utterly inapplicable : but
 must only be considered as a dependent being ; and a
 subject of the great Sovereign of the Universe. Now to
 the one God and Father of all ; the sovereign, independ-
 ent, and unchangeable Deity, be ascribed all glory, and
 praise, by Christ Jesus for ever. AMEN.

DISCOURSES ON THE DIVINE UNITY.

DISCOURSE VII.

John Chap. xvii. ver. 3. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

WHEN we took these words under our consideration at first, we proposed to make them the ground-work and basis of our reasoning; and by an appeal to the scriptures at large, to endeavour to enforce and establish the following propositions.

First, that there is one person or intelligent agent, who alone is God, Supreme, almighty, and eternal; and that this one person is the Father, or as he is sometimes called in scripture, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God.

Secondly, that Jesus Christ is not the most high God; but a being inferior to him, dependant upon him, and acting by his command and authority: or in other words his Son, Servant, and Messenger; and by the Father's appointment, the Messiah, or only Mediator between God and Man. That they might know Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

And Thirdly, and Lastly, to consider and answer the objections, that the Trinitarians make to our hypothesis, and urge in support of their own, founded on various places both of the Old and New Testament.

It was the object of our first, second, and third discourses, to prove the truth of the first proposition. And in our fourth, fifth, and sixth discourses, we fully established

blished the truth and certainty of the second. We now enter upon the third and last part of our subject; which was to consider and answer the objections, that the Trinitarians make to our hypothesis, and urge in support of their own, founded on various places both of the Old and New Testament. I sincerely wish, that I may be enabled to do this in such a clear and satisfactory manner; as to enlighten the understandings, and produce a conviction in the minds of those; who are unhappily entangled in the paths of error; and misled by those who have an interest to deceive them; and who imagine that they are contending for the faith of Christ; when they are undermining the foundation of all true and rational religion. In combating our opponents, I shall confine myself solely to their scriptural objections, founded on false readings, mis-translations, or erroneous interpretations of the word of God. For I apprehend, that nothing deserving confutation can be offered, in vindication of a Trinity in Unity from principles of reason. That noble faculty; that candle of the Lord, which he hath lighted up in the breast of man, can never be reconciled to this doctrine; but must always pronounce it a contradiction: and some Trinitarians have been ready enough to own the truth of this assertion. One eminent opponent observes, that if the doctrine of the Trinity were not to be adored as a Mystery, it would be exploded as an absurdity: † and another thinks it an argument in favour of this opinion, that it is a thing so inexplicable in its own nature, that if it had not been revealed, it could never have entered into the mind of man, ‡ which plea might be urged with great propriety in defence of transubstantiation. In obviating objections, we shall follow the order of the books of scripture as much as possible; and never depart from this rule, unless by bringing passages of a similar nature together, where one reply will serve them all equally well. First, we shall consider the objection which are taken from the Old Testament: next those which are supposed to oc-

† Dr South.

car

‡ Bp. Beveridge.

cur in the Evangelists : and lastly those which are found in the Acts of the Apostles ; the Epistles of St Paul, and others ; and in the Apocalypse or Revelation of St John. As every person who has perused the preceding discourses, must be supposed to be now fully acquainted with our method ; we shall therefore in order to prevent unnecessary repetitions, forbear to recapitulate the propositions as usual, in the beginning of every discourse ; but shall enter directly upon our subject, and pursue the train of objections without interruption. We proceed then to consider the objections from the Old Testament Gen. i. 1. " In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," Heb. "BARA ELOHIM Gods he created." In our first discourse (p. 11. 12, to which we refer the reader) we said enough to prove the singular signification of the Hebrew word Elohim or Aleim. But as we would wish to give as much satisfaction as possible, to those who may be apt to lay a stress upon this objection : we shall here add the following observations. Moses whom all must grant to be a single person, is called Elohim in scripture, Exod. vii. 1. " See I have made thee a God (Heb. Elohim) to Pharaoh. The plural number is also used in regard to Dagon the false God of the Philistines, Judges xvi 23. " Then the Lords of the Philistines gathered them together, for to offer a great sacrifice unto Dagon their God, and to rejoice : for they said, our God (Heb. Elohem) hath delivered Samson our enemy into our hand. It has been frequently observed by learned men, that words denoting power, dominion, dignity and authority ; such as Adonim, and Baalim, are of a plural termination in Hebrew. In particular the word ADON, which signifies a Lord, or a Master, is several times used in the plural concerning single persons, thus Gen. xxxix 20. " And Joseph's master (Heb. ADONE, masters which is the plural in construction) took him and put him into prison." Gen. xlii. 30. " The man who is the Lord (Heb. ADONE, Lords) of the land". V. 33. " And the man the Lord (Heb. ADONE Lords) of the country." 1 Kings xvi.

24. And he bought the hill Samaria of Shemer, for two talents of silver, and built on the hill, and called the name of the city which he built, after the name of Shemer, owner (Heb. ADONE owners or proprietors) of the hill, Samaria. This word also occurs in the same form in some other places. The like usage of the plural for the singular is found in the following passages. Psal. cxlix. 2. "Let Israel rejoice in him that made him." (Heb. in his makers) Eccles. xii. 1. "Remember thy Creator:" (Heb. Creators) Isaiah liv. 5. "Thy maker is thine husband." (Heb. thy makers is thine husbands) Prov. ix. 10. "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and the knowledge of the holy (Heb. holy ones) is understanding. A Trinitarian writer, † would infer from the four last quotations; and from three or four passages of a like nature, as well as from the word Elohim, that there are a plurality of persons in the Deity. But there is just as good reason for concluding, that there was a plurality of persons in Moses, in Dagon the false God of the Philistines, in Potiphar, in Joseph; or in Shemer the original proprietor of the hill of Samaria. These quotations are I think fully sufficient to prove, that the word Elohim ought to be considered as an irregularity or peculiarity of the Hebrew tongue; and our translators have done extremely well in rendering it, and other words of a similar nature, in the singular number. Some learned men have imagined, that the word Elohim is an elliptical form of speaking for ELOHA ELOHIM the God of Gods. But Le Clerc is of opinion, that it took its rise from the ancient inhabitants of Palestine, who worshipped a plurality of Gods; and so had frequent occasion to speak of Elohim, the Gods: and that the Patriarchs and their descendants, who lived among them and spoke the same language, came in time to use this word in a singular signification, to denote the one true God. Several learned Trinitarians, such as, Druſus, Cajetan, Bellarmine, and Mercer, have given up the word Elohim; and fairly

† Mr Jones, Author of the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity.

fairly owned its singular signification: and Calvin in particular expresses himself in the following manner concerning this word; speaking of those who make use of it as an argument in favour of the Trinity. " They think
 " they are in possession of a testimony against the Arians,
 " in order to prove the Divinity of the Son and Spirit:
 " but in the mean time they involve themselves in the
 " error of Sabellius. For Moses afterwards adds that
 " Elohim spoke: and that the Spirit of Elohim moved
 " upon the waters. If these persons are noted here
 " there will be no distinction between them. And it
 " will follow, that the Son was begotten by himself; and
 " that the Spirit does not proceed from the Father but
 " from himself." Again Calvin makes this remark."
 " Moses uses the word Elohim which is of the plural
 " number. From which it is usual to infer, that there
 " are three persons in the Godhead. But this proof
 " of so important a doctrine appears to me to be by no
 " means solid; and therefore, I will not insist upon this
 " word. But rather incline to warn my readers, against
 " violent interpretations of this kind." †

Gen. i. 2. 3. " The Spirit of God moved upon the face
 of the waters. And God said, let there be light: and
 there was light." This passage has been sometimes used
 to prove, that the eternal Word or Son, (as Trinitarians
 speak) and the holy spirit were equally concerned with
 the

" Putant illi se testimonium habere adversus Arianos, ad
 " probandum Filii et Spiritus divinitatem: interea in-
 " volvant se in errorem Sabellii. Quia postea subjicit
 " Moses, Elohim locutum esse. Et Spiritum Elohim in-
 " cubuisse aquis. Si tres personas notari placet, nulla
 " erit earum distinctio. Sequitur enim et Filium a
 " se genitum, et Spiritum non esse Patris, sed sui ipsius."
 " Habetur apud Moysen Elohim, nomen pluralis nu-
 " meri. Unde colligere solent hic in Deo notari tres
 " personas. Sed quia parum solida mihi videtur tantæ
 " rei probatio, ego in voce non insistam. Quia potius
 " monendi sunt lectores, ut sibi a violentis ejusmodi
 " glossis caveant. Calvin.

the Father, in the creation of the world. But this is a far-fetched and strained interpretation. For the Spirit or breath of God moving or brooding upon the waters, appears here, plainly to denote, that energy and influence of the supreme being, which was exerted in the production and formation of the world; and the Chaldee interpreter Oakeles renders it, *Ventum Dei*, the wind of God. The expression, God said, signifies nothing more, but the divine volition or command, which accompanied by his power, produced all the different parts of nature.

Gen. i. 26. "And God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness." Gen. iii. 22. "And the Lord God said, behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil." Gen. xi. 7. "Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech." Isaiah, vi. 8. "Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, whom shall I send and who will go for us? In our first discourse, (p. 12. 13 to which we entreat the reader to turn) we obviated any objections that might be raised from these places; but it may be proper here to add the following remarks. Our Lord Jesus Christ himself, whom our adversaries dare not deny to have been one person, speaks in the plural, John iii. xi. "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, we speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen, and ye receive not our witness." St Paul also who was undoubtedly one person, and not more, speaks also in the plural frequently in his Epistles; and particularly so in the two following passages, 2 Cor. x. 2. "I think to be bold against some, who think of us as if we walked according to the flesh. For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, &c." Ver. 10. 11. "For his letters (say they) are weighty and powerful, but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech contemptible. Let such a one think this, that such as we are in word by letters, when we are absent, such will we be also in deed, when we are present, &c." Instances of the like form of speech occur in the Old Testament:

Testament. 2 Sam. xvi. 20. "Then said Absalom to Ahitophel, give counsel among you what we shall do" Cant i. 4 "Draw me, we will run after thee." Dan ii. 36. "This is the dream; and we will tell the interpretation thereof before the King" Instances of the plural being used for the singular, might also be produced from the best writers ancient and modern. From these quotations, as well as from other considerations, it appears how contemptibly weak it is in some Trinitarians, to infer a plurality of persons in the Deity, from his being described as speaking in the plural, in a few places of scripture; in defiance of thousands of passages wherein he speaks in the singular. The former may be easily accounted for, upon the system that God is one person: but no good reason can be assigned for the latter, on the supposition of a plurality of divine persons. The learned Grotius remarks on Gen. i. 26. "It is the custom of the Hebrews to speak of God as a King. Kings are guided, by the advice of their principal subjects in important matters. 1 Kings xii. 6, 2 Chron. x. 9. So is God represented, 1 Kings xxii. 19. 20." † Calvin observes on Gen. iii. 22. "Whereas, many christians from this place, draw the doctrine of a Trinity of persons in the Deity; I fear their argument is not solid." ‡

Gen. xvi. 13. "And she (Hagar) called the name of the Lord that spake to her, thou God seekest me, &c."

Gen xviii. 2. "And the Lord appeared unto Abraham in the plains of Mamre; and he sat in the tent door in the heat of the day." And he lift up his eyes and looked, and lo, three men stood by him &c." Ver.

13

† Gen. i. 26. *Faciamus*) "Mos est Hebreis de Deo, ut de Rege loqui. Reges res magnas agunt de consilio primorum, 1 Reg. xii. 6. 2 Paral. x. 9. Sic et Deus. 1 Reg. xxii. 19. 20." Grotius.

‡ "Quod autem eliciunt ex hoc loco christiani doctrinam de tribus in Deo personis, vercor ne satis firmum sit argumentum." Calvin.

13. " And the Lord (Heb. Jehovah) said unto Abraham, &c " Gen. xxxii. 24. " And Jacob was left alone; and there wrestled a man with him, until the breaking of the day." Ver. 30. " And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel; for I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved." Gen. xxxv.

1. " And God said unto Jacob, arise, go up to Bethel, and dwell there: and make thee an altar unto God, that appeared unto thee when thou fleddest from the face of Esau thy brother." Gen. xlviii. 16. " The Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads." Jud.

ges. vi. 12. " And the Angel of the Lord appeared unto him, and said unto him, the Lord is with thee, thou mighty man of valour, &c." Judges xiii. 3.

" And the Angel of the Lord appeared unto the Woman, and said unto her, behold now, thou art barren and bearest not; but thou shalt conceive and bear a son ver. 22. And Manoah said unto his wife, we shall surely die, because we have seen God. We have put all

these places together, as one reply will be sufficient for them all. Because Almighty God spoke to Hagar, Abraham, Jacob, Gideon and Manoah, by the ministry of

Angels, who are called sometimes God, and at other times Jehovah, because, they represented his person, and acted in his name, and by his authority, therefore some

patrons of the doctrine of the Trinity have asserted, that one of these Angels was really God equal with the Father; or the person of our Saviour prior to the Incar-

nation. But there is no foundation in scripture for this conjecture. It is no where said, that our Saviour ap-

peared to mankind, under the Patriarchal or Jewish dispensations. On the contrary, this notion is rather

contradicted by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, Chap. i. 1. " God who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the Fathers

by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son:" which seems to imply, that he had not spoken to mankind before by him. Whereas, the notion

entertained by some of our opponents supposes, that he

had frequently been sent on messages to mankind; and had conversed with the Patriarchs and Jews face to face. Again, the author of the same Epistle to the Hebrews, as an encouragement to the virtue of hospitality observes." Chap. xiii. 2. "Be not forgetful to entertain strangers: for thereby some have entertained Angels unawares:" which shews that the three men who appeared unto Abraham, one of whom assumed the character of Jehovah; were considered by the author of this Epistle in no other light, than as messengers of the supreme being. For had one of these Angels been God himself, he might have used a far stronger argument for the exercise of hospitality. He might have said that some had not only entertained Angels but even the Supreme Being unawares. But it deserves to be taken notice of here, that the term Angel in scripture does not always denote an intellectual being, distinct from Almighty God. An excellent and valuable writer observes as follows. "MALACH an Angel, signifies
 " a messenger, an executor of some command or purpose. The common meaning of the word, and a
 " very just one, is, when it is put for one of those higher orders of beings, whom the scriptures speak of
 " as employed by God on messages to man. So Gabriel was sent (Dan. ix. 21) to Daniel, to Zacharias, and
 " Mary, Luke i. 19. 26. Angels were sent to the shepherds, Luke ii. 13; to the Apostles, Acts i. 10. But
 " this term, angel, has another signification in the scriptures; and does by no means always stand for a spiritual intelligent agent, though by a vulgar error, it is
 " almost universally so understood. That most learned Jew, Maimonides makes this observation. † " You
 " know

† Nōsti quod Malach, angelus, significet legatum nuncium. Et quisvis qui mandatum aliquod expedit; est angelus; ita et de motu animalium irrationalium quoque dicatur, illum fieri per manum angeli, quando ille motus est ad intentionem creatoris, qui indidit eis facultatem, qua illo motu movere possant. Sic dicitur,
 " Deus

“ know that Malach, angel, signifies an ambassador,
 “ messenger. An angel also is whatever executes an
 “ order or commission; so that it is applicable to the
 “ movements of brute creatures, that they are produ-
 “ ced by the hand of an angel, when they follow the
 “ will of the creator who puts them in such a disposition
 “ by which they are moved to and so to act. So it is
 “ said. Dan. 6. 22. My God hath sent his angel, and
 “ hath shut the lion’s mouths, that they have not hurt
 “ me. — Nay the elements themselves are called an-
 “ gels; as Psal. civ. 4. Who maketh winds, his
 “ Angels; and flaming fire, his ministers.” † Ano-
 “ ther learned writer has the following remark on
 “ the subject of which we are speaking. The Shechi-
 “ nah, or material symbol of glory, and the oracle from
 “ thence, may be called the angel of the Lord, and it is
 “ actually so called in scripture. Thus the Shechinah,
 “ which Moses saw in the fire in the bush, and the voice
 “ of the oracle which he heard from thence, are called
 “ the angel of the Lord. And the Shechinah which
 “ conducted the Israelites in a pillar of cloud and fire,
 “ is also called the angel of Jehovah. So that the ap-
 “ pearance and voice of Jehovah in the midst of the fire,
 “ and the angel, which spake to Moses on Mount Sinai,
 “ are equivalent expressions. And thus also in the lan-
 “ guage of the Chaldee paraphrase, the Shechinah of
 “ Jehovah, the MIMRA DE ADONAI (that is the word of
 “ the Lord,) are both of them equivalent to the voice of
 “ Jehovah, or the voice of the Angel of the presence, or
 “ the divine majesty and glory. This observation;
 “ which is not a bare conjecture of criticism, but which
 “ is founded on many concurrent and diverse evidences,
 will,
 “ Deus meus misit angelum suum, et conclusit os leo-
 “ num, et non perdiderunt me. — Quia imò elementa
 “ ipsa vocantur angeli; ut, qui facit angelos suos, ven-
 “ tos; ministros suos, ignem flammantem.” Maim.
 More Nevochim. p. 200.

† Mr Lindsey’s Sequel to his Apology. p. 314.

“ will, I conceive, take away the force of what is objec-
 “ ted, viz. that we must understand the appearance in
 “ the Shechinah of some spiritual being representing
 “ God; because it is ascribed to angels, and the appear-
 “ ance itself, is often called in scripture the angel of Je-
 “ hovah. For it appears, that the Shechinah, and the
 “ oracle themselves, may, in a very proper sense, be
 “ styled the angel of the Lord; though the true God
 “ himself was the only spirit or intelligent agent, who
 “ acted upon them, and manifested himself by them; as
 “ much as if they were acted upon by some other spirit,
 “ whom God sent to represent him in the visible appear-
 “ ance of the Shechinah, and by the audible voice of
 “ the oracle. The fire and the voice, were as properly
 “ angels, in the language of Scripture; as any intelligent
 “ beings, or Spirits.” † But whether we are to under-
 stand by the term, the angel of the Lord, the Shechinah
 itself, or any distinct intellectual being representing God;
 there can be no argument raised from it to prove, that
 Jesus Christ is God or equal with the Father. For the
 Trinitarians have no authority from Scripture to say that
 Jesus Christ appeared in this manner: and although it
 were granted that he had so appeared, it would not
 prove that he was God, but only that he represented the
 person and majesty of God. Some Trinitarians have
 affirmed, that Jesus Christ appeared in the Bush to Moses,
 but St Stephen tells us Acts vii. 30, that it was an angel.
 It has also been asserted, that Christ delivered the Law to
 the Jews on Mount Sinai; but the same Stephen informs
 us Acts vii. 53. that the Jews received the law by the dis-
 position of Angels; and St. Paul affirms Gal. iii. 19
 that “ it was ordained by Angels in the hand of a Medi-
 ator;” which Mediator was Moses. But the author of
 the Epistle to the Hebrews affords the strongest argu-
 ment, against the notion of Christ being concerned in
 the delivery of the Law from Mount Sinai. Heb. ii. 2.
 3. “ If the word spoken by angels was stedfast, and
 every transgression and disobedience received a just recom-
 pence

† Lowman's Tracts.

pence of reward; how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord." Here there is an opposition between the word spoken by angels, (by which undoubtedly the Mosaic law is meant) and the salvation spoken by the Lord; and we are led to understand, that the danger of neglecting the latter, is greater than the former, because it was spoken by him. But if our Lord had been the author of both dispensations, there would have been no reason for the apostle to insinuate, that a greater punishment would be inflicted for the neglect of the one more than that of the other, and so the force of his argument, for giving peculiar attention to the Gospel dispensation, would be destroyed. But we proceed to the consideration of other objections.

Gen. xix. 24. "Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah, brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven." In the Hebrew it is, "Jehovah rained fire from Jehovah," from which some would inter, that there are two persons to whom the title of Jehovah belongs. But we are expressly told by the sacred writers that there is but one Jehovah; and many instances of a similar way of speaking, both in regard to God and man, may be produced from the scriptures, thus Gen. v. 1. In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him; that is, he made him in the likeness of himself; 1 Sam. iii. 21, "And the Lord appeared again in Shiloh: for the Lord revealed himself to Samuel in Shiloh by the word of the Lord." 1 Kings viii. 1. "Then Solomon assembled the elders of Israel, and all the heads of the tribes, the chief of the Fathers of the children of Israel unto King Solomon, &c." 1 Kings xii. 21. And when Rehoboam was come to Jerusalem, he assembled all the house of Judah, — to bring the kingdom again to Rehoboam; &c. No body concludes from these two last passages, that there were two Solomons, or two Rehoboams, why then should it be supposed from a like form of expression, that there are two Jehovahs? See also 1 Sam. xv. 22. 1 Kings x. 13. 2 Chron. vii. 2. Dan. ix. 17. Zech. x. 12. John iv. 1. 2 Tim. i. 18. Sebastian Castilio
has

has very properly rendered this passage. "Jova ab se
 " de caelo sulphur et ignem in Sodomam et Gomorram
 " depluit." The Lord rained from himself out of hea-
 ven, brimstone and fire upon Sodom and Gomorrah.

Some have supposed, that the Angels who were sent
 to destroy Sodom are here called Jehovah in the first
 place, as representing the supreme being. Others have
 imagined that the fire and brimstone is called fire from
 Jehovah; on account of the fury and vehemence with
 which it descended; and the dreadful desolation it oc-
 casioned. But there is no necessity to have recourse to
 either of these suppositions, as the expression may be
 very well accounted for from the known phraseology of
 scripture.

Gen. 20. 3. "And it came to pass when God
 caused me to wander from my Father's house, (Heb."
 Gods they caused me to wander,) Gen. 35. 7. "And
 he built an altar, and called the place El-beth-el, because
 there God appeared into him," (Heb." Gods they ap-
 peared unto him.") 2 Sam. vii. 23. "And what one na-
 tion in the earth is like thy people, even like Israel whom
 God went to redeem (Heb. "Gods, they went, or have
 gone to redeem.") Dent. iv. 7. "And what nation is
 there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them." (Heb."
 ELOHIM KZREBIM, Gods who are so near.") In the
 three first of these passages, the verb as well as the nomin-
 ative case is plural; and in the last the adjective is so,
 which amounts to the same thing. But no argument can
 be raised from them in favour of the notion of a Trinity
 of persons in one divine essence. On the contrary, as the
 verb or adjective is plural as well as the nominative;
 they would rather prove a plurality of Gods or separate
 essences. A learned Trinitarian commentator observes
 on Gen. 20. 13. "Gods they caused me to wander,"
 &c, as follows. "The Hebrew word which we trans-
 late wander, being the plural number, the Septuagint
 render the word Elohim (God) the angels; who by
 the command of God led him (Abraham) from his Fa-
 ther's house, through diverse countries. But the Chal-
 dee translates it, when because of the Idols of Chaldaea,

I was

“ I was called away from my own country, &c. “ For
 “ so the Gods, that is, the Idol Gods, might be said to
 “ cause him to wander, because it was by reason of them,
 “ that God would not have him stay any longer in his
 “ own country. But there is no need of these devices;
 “ nothing being more usual in the Hebrew language, than
 “ for the plural number to be put instead of the singular,
 “ especially when they speak of God, as Bechart observes
 “ in many places, Gen. xxxv. 7 Exod. xxxi. 4 Psal.
 “ cxlix. 2 Eccles. xii. 1 See Hicoro. P. 1. L. 2. C. 34.
 “ Nay Hackspan hath rightly observed, that there are
 “ nouns of the plural number in their termination, which
 “ in signification are singular; with which it is usual to
 “ join a verb of the plural number, because of the plu-
 “ ral termination of the noun. A plain example of which
 “ we have in Gen. iv. 6. Why is thy countenance (Hebrew
 “ faces) fallen? The like he observes in the Syriac language,
 “ John i. 4. the life (in the Syriac lives) was the light
 “ of men ” †

2 Sam. xxiii. 3. “ The spirit of the Lord spake
 by me, and his word was in my tongue. The God of
 Israel said. &c.” Job. xxvi. 13. “ By his spirit he
 hath garnished the heaven, his hand hath formed the
 crooked Serpent.” Job. xxxiii. 4. “ The spirit of God
 hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath
 given me life,” Psal. xxxiii. 6. “ By the word of
 the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them
 by the breath, or SPIRIT of his mouth.” Psal. cxxxix.
 7. “ Whether shall I go from thy spirit; or whether
 shall I flee from thy presence. Isaiah xxxiv. 16. Seek
 ye out the book of the Lord and read, for my mouth it
 hath commanded, and his spirit it hath gathered them,
 Isaiah xlviii. 16. “ And now the Lord God and his
 spirit hath sent me.” Micah ii. 7. “ O thou that art
 named the house of Jacob, is the spirit of the Lord
 straitened.” Zech. iv. 6. “ Not by might, nor by
 power, but by my spirit saith the Lord of hosts.” These
 and similar passages from the Old Testament, have been
 sometimes

† Bp. Patrick's Com.

sometimes urged to prove, the existence and distinct personality of a third person in the Godhead; whom the Trinitarians call, God the Holy Ghost. But they are quite foreign to the purpose, and prove on the contrary, that the spirit of God signifies nothing else, but the divine influence, energy, power, or operation. The Jews by the words Spirit, and Holy Spirit, never understood any distinct agent, or separate person in the Deity; as will appear by the following quotation from Maimonides. “ The word RUACH or Spirit has various significations. 1. It signifies the air, that is, one of the “ four elements. Gen. i. 2. “ And the spirit of the “ Lord moved upon the face of the waters. 2 It signifies wind. Exod. x. 13. “ And the east wind “ brought the Locusts.” Ver. 19. “ And the Lord “ turned a mighty strong west-wind, which took away “ the locusts. And it has this sense very often. 3. It “ is taken for the vital breath. Gen. vi. 17. “ All flesh “ wherein is the breath of life (to which may be added “ that passage of the Psalmist. Psal lxxviii. 39. “ He remembered that they were but flesh, a wind, a “ SPIRIT, that passeth away, and cometh not again) “ 4. It is taken for the incorruptible part of man “ which survives after death, Eccles. xii. 7. And the “ spirit shall return to God who gave it.” 5. It signifies the Divine influence inspiring the prophets by “ virtue of which thy prophesied ————— “ Num. bers,

† “ RUACH vox est homonyma. Significat enim, “ primo, Aërem, hoc est, unum ex quatuor elementis: ut “ VERUACH, et Spiritus Domini incubabat super aquas. “ Gen. i. 2. Deinde significat spiritum flantem, h. e. “ ventum. Ut VERUACH, et spiritus (ventus) orientalis “ attulit locustas. Exod. x. 13. Item. RUACH, spiritus “ occidentalis. Ib. Ver. 19. Et sic sæpissime. Tertio, “ sumitur pro spiritu vitali. Ut RUACH spiritus vitæ. “ Gen. vi. 17. Quarto, sumitur de parte illa hominis “ incorruptibili, quæ superstes remanet post mortem. “ Ut VERUACH, et spiritus hominis redit ad Deum, qui dedit

bers xi. 17. "I will take of the spirit, that is in
 thee, and will put it upon them" ver. 26. "And
 the Spirit rested upon them." 2 Sam. 23. 2. "The
 spirit of the Lord spake by me." 6. It signifies design
 purpose or intention. Pro. xxix. 11. "A fool
 uttereth all his mind or spirit that is all his intention
 or purpose." Isaiah xix. 3. "And the spirit of
 Egypt shall fail in the midst thereof, and I will de-
 stroy the counsel thereof, that is, I will confound
 her purposes, and disarrange her government."
 Isaiah xl. 13. "Who hath directed the spirit of the
 Lord, or being his counsellor hath taught him." which
 means, that none knows the purposes of his will;
 or can investigate or point out to him, the plan upon
 " which
 " dedit eum. Eccles. xii. 7. Quinto, significat Influen-
 " tiam Divinam, a Deo prophetis instillatam, cujus vir-
 " tute prophetabant. ————— Et separabo,
 " MIN RUACH, de spiritu, qui est in te, et ponam in eis,
 " Numb 11. 17. Et fuit, cum quievisset super eos
 " HARUACH spiritus. ver 26. Item, RUACH spiritus
 " locutus est in me. 2 Sam. xxiii. 2. Sexto, significat
 " quoque propositum et voluntatem. Ut KOL RUCHO,
 " omnem spiritum suum profert stultus. Pr. xxix 11.
 " hoc est, omnem intentionem, voluntatem suam. Sic,
 " et exhaustietur RUACH spiritus Ægypti in medio
 " ejus, et consilium ejus absorbeo. Is. xix. 3 i. e.
 " dissipabitur propositum ipsius, et gubernatio ipsius
 " abscondetur. Sic, Quis direxit Ruach Domini, et
 " quis vir consilii ejus, ut indicare possit eum. Is. xl.
 " 13. hoc est, Quis est, qui sciat ordinem voluntatis ejus,
 " aut qui apprehendat et assequatur, qua ratione hanc
 " rerum universitatem gubernet, et qui eum indicare
 " posset. Vides ergo, quod haec vox, Ruach, quan-
 " do Deo attribuitur, ubique sumatur partim in quin-
 " ta, partim in sexta et ultima significatione, quatenus
 " voluntatem significat. Exponatur in quoque loco
 " pro ratione rerum et circumstantiarum. Maimon.
 " More Nevochim.

" which he governs the system of the universe. It is
 " evident then, that the word, RUACH, or Spirit, when
 " spoken of God, is to be understood, partly in the fifth;
 " and partly in the sixth and last acceptation of the
 " word, as signifying the divine will. And it must be
 " explained as the reason and circumstances of things
 " direct." From what this intelligent Jew has ad-
 vanced, as well as from the nature of the thing itself,
 it is evident to me, that there is no foundation for
 supposing, that any distinct agent is meant by the
 words Spirit and Holy Spirit, in the Old Testament, dif-
 ferent from Jehovah, the God of Israel; styled in the
 New Testament, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus
 Christ. The words, RUACH, in Hebrew, PNEUMA, in
 Greek, and SPIRITUS in Latin, in their original accep-
 tation, denote all the very same thing; and when ap-
 plied to the divine being, as operating upon his crea-
 tures, signify, some kind of influence or communication
 from him, some exertion of his power and agency.
 It was by this breath, or operation, and influence of the
 Almighty, that the whole system of nature was produ-
 ced, and by this it is continually preserved. It was
 this principle that dwelt in the Prophets, and Apostles,
 and was imparted in the largest degree to our Lord Je-
 sus Christ. It is a prodigious error in the Trinitarians,
 to make an intelligent agent equal with God the Fa-
 ther, out of an attribute or property of the divine nature.
 It is true that there is more to be said for the person-
 ality of the Holy Ghost, from the New Testament than
 from the Old. But then, those passages which most fa-
 vour this notion will be found equally strong to prove,
 that if there is such a distinct agent or being, as the Holy
 Spirit, that he is inferior to, and altogether dependant
 upon God the Father. So that our system will not be
 invalidated, nor that of our opponents promoted by this
 opinion, even tho' it should appear to be founded in
 truth. We will have occasion to resume this subject
 again; and to treat it more fully, when we come to
 consider

consider the objections from the New Testament. In our next discourse, the remaining objections that are supposed to occur in the books of the Old Testament; and to favour the system of our opponents, will be examined and removed. To God only wise be glory by Christ Jesus, for ever, AMEN.

DISCOURSES ON THE DIVINE UNITY.

DISCOURSE VIII.

John Chap. xvii. ver. 3. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

IN our seventh discourse, we entered upon the third and last part of our subject, which was to consider and answer the objections, that the Trinitarians make to our hypothesis, and urge in support of their own, founded on various places both of the Old and New Testament

We proposed first, to consider the objections which are supposed to occur in the Old Testament; next those in the Evangelists; and lastly those which are found in the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of St Paul, and others, and in the Apocalypse or Revelation of St John. We examined, and replied to several objections from the Old Testament; and in our present discourse we continue the same subject. The first passage that occurs to us is the following.

Job xix. 25. "For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth. And though after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; tho' my reins be consumed within me." Several words have been inserted in this passage by our translators, to make out what they supposed to be the sense of it. Neither, day, worms, nor body, occur in the original Hebrew; and

and several learned commentators consider it, not as referring to the general resurrection of the dead: but as expressive of the hopes of Job, to be delivered even in this life, from the loathsome disease, and grievous calamities with which he was afflicted; which consumed and wasted his body; and that Almighty God would appear at last as his Redeemer, or the vindicator of his innocence, and restore him again to a state of health and vigour; which in the conclusion of his history we find he actually did. An ingenious writer on the book of Job translates this passage as follows: "For I know that my avenger liveth, and that he will at last stand on the earth; and although my skin be torn in this manner, yet in my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see on my side as mine eyes have beheld him, for he is no stranger: my reins within me are ready to faint with longing for him." But although we should suppose Job to allude here to the future resurrection; yet, as he had no explicit knowledge of the doctrines of the Gospel, nothing farther could be drawn from this passage, but only his belief that God would at some future distant period, raise him from the dead, make his innocence appear, and abundantly reward him for his sufferings. To apply this passage to Jesus Christ, from the mere sound of the word Redeemer in our English version, is quite extravagant. For Jehovah, or God the Father, is in various places of the old Testament, styled the Redeemer or deliverer of his people. See Psal cxxxvi. 24. &c.

Psal ii 7. "I will declare the decree the Lord hath said unto me: thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." This place has been alledged to prove, the supposed eternal generation which the Trinitarians ascribe to Jesus Christ: but it has not the smallest relation to that subject. The generation here spoken of, is a generation performed at some particular time "this day have I begotten thee;" but an eternal generation can never be fixed to any period; but must always be performing and yet never performed. We find this passage applied in the New Testament, to the resurrection, the exaltation, and

Priesthood

Priesthood of Christ. Acts xiii. 32, 33. "And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto the Fathers: God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again, as it is also written in the second Psalm, thou art my Son this day have I begotten thee." Heb. i. 3. 4. 5. "When he (the Son) had by himself purged our sins, he sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high: being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For unto which of the Angels said he at any time, thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?" Heb. v. 5. So also Christ glorified not himself, to be made an high priest; but he that said unto him thou art my Son, to day have I begotten thee."

Psal. xxiv. 7. 10. "Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, and the king of glory shall come in — Who is this king of glory? The Lord of hosts, he is the king of glory." Because in 1 Cor. ii 3. Christ is styled "the Lord of Glory;" therefore, some of our opponents have concluded, that he is the King of Glory, and Lord of Hosts mentioned here: and that this passage relates to his ascension into heaven after his resurrection. But there is no connection betwixt these two places of scripture. The king of Glory mentioned in the Psalms, is Jehovah, the God of Israel, the Father of Christ: and the Lord of Glory mentioned by St. Paul, is his Son, who was crucified. Nor does this place of Scripture refer to the ascension and exaltation of Christ: but to the removal of the ark from the house of Obed-edom, and its being placed with great triumph by David in the Tabernacle, in his own city. See 2: Sam vi. 12. &c.

Psal. xlv. 6. 7. Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness: therefore God, thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." This place is applied to Christ in Heb. i. 3. "But unto the Son he saith, thy throne;

throne, O God, is for ever and ever, &c. The expression (Eisaka Elohim,) in the Hebrew original, and (ho thronos sou ho Theos,) in the Greek, may be rendered, God, is thy throne for ever and ever, that is he is the establisher and support of thy throne. And this sense agrees extremely well with several places of scripture, where the kingdom of Christ is spoken of, or alluded to, as. 2 Sam. vii 13. 16. "I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever. . . . And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee: thy throne shall be established for ever." Psal. lxxxix. 3. 4. "I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant. Thy seed will I establish for ever, and build up thy throne to all generations." See also 1 Chron. xvii. 12. 14. There is nothing harsh in this Translation, and the original will very well bear it; as both the Hebrew and the Greek are ambiguous. But admitting the propriety of the common translation, our cause will not be affected by it in the least: for Christ is only called God here in the inferior sense, because he is expressly said to have a God; who on account of his having loved righteousness and hated iniquity, has anointed him with the oil of gladness above his fellows, (Gr. METACHOI, fellows or partners) that is above all those, whether Angels or Men, who have filled offices of dignity, authority, and trust; and may be called Gods in the inferior acception of the word. This passage then, (supposing the common translation to be just) is so far from invalidating our system, that it strengthens and confirms it in the strongest terms. It shews, that the word God when applied to Christ in the most precise and solemn manner is only to be understood in a qualified and limited sense; and that there is a God over him and superior to him, who for his distinguished fidelity, and eminent attachment to the cause of righteousness, has been pleased to advance him to a more exalted and illustrious station, than he has thought fit to confer upon any other being. What a mean unworthy artifice is it in the Trinitarians to say, that "Thy throne O God

is for ever and ever, &c." is to be understood of the supposed divine nature of Christ; and, that "thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity, &c" respects his human nature. This is shifting the person of Christ just as it suits their own principles; and grossly perverting the words of scripture. Neither the Psalmist nor the author of this Epistle, furnish any handle for an interpretation of this kind. They speak of the Son as one single agent, or being, who at the same time that his throne is established for ever and ever, is also anointed by his God with the oil of gladness above his fellows.

Psal. lxxviii. 18. "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men; yea for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them." We find this passage in part quoted by St Paul. Eph. iv. 7. 8. "But unto every one of us is given grace, according to the measure of the gift of Christ. Wherefore he saith when he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive and gave gifts unto men. This passage was originally spoken of God, whom David celebrates in beautiful metaphorical language; as having subdued and carried into captivity the enemies of his people; and afterwards as ascending into heaven like a triumphant conqueror laden with spoil; and dispensing gifts and bounties upon his people; and even to those who had formerly been rebellious. The Apostle accommodates this figurative passage of the Psalmist to Christ; and represents him in like manner as leading into captivity all the spiritual enemies of christians; and bestowing gifts and graces upon the church of different kinds, raising some to the rank of Apostles, others of Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors, and Teachers: and filling all things, that is animating, conducting, and guiding that body, of which he is the head. Christ was enabled to do this in consequence of the promise of the Holy Ghost, which he received of the Father, and shed forth in an eminent degree, upon his first followers. The allusion of the Apostle is exceedingly elegant, but is no
more

more than an allusion to, or an allegorical interpretation of the words of David. It is not unusual with the sacred writers, to apply facts and circumstances under the Jewish dispensation, to the state of things under the Christian; thus the words of Hosea. Chap. xi. 1. "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt;" which are plainly spoken of the whole body of Jews, that came out of Egypt under the conduct of Moses; are applied by St Matthew to the return of our Lord Jesus Christ from that country, Math. ii. 15. "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, out of Egypt have I called my Son." It is then a very erroneous conclusion, in some of our opponents to imagine, that a whole Psalm is applicable to Christ, because part of a verse is accommodated to him. Nay, though it were granted, that that verse was a prophecy of Christ, it would not follow that the rest of the Psalm could be applied to him; for the authors of these divine compositions sometimes break forth into prophetic raptures and excursions; and mingle allusions to the Gospel dispensation with the transactions of their own times.

Psal. lxxviii. 56. "They tempted and provoked the most high God, and kept not his testimonies." 1 Cor. x. 9. "Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents." From these two passages taken together, some Trinitarians would infer, that Christ was the most high God spoken of in the Psalms. But there is no ground for a conclusion of this kind; so contrary to many express declarations of scripture. Neither will it follow, that because the Apostle exhorts the Corinthians not to tempt Christ; that therefore he was the most high God, whom the Israelites tempted in the wilderness. A learned commentator conjectures, that the word, God, is to be understood after tempted, and translates the verse as follows. "Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted God, and were destroyed of serpents." §

§ Le Clerc.

But

R

But it ought to be mentioned here, that the ancient Alexandrian Manuscript reads, "Neither let us tempt God," in place of Christ; and some later ones either agree in the same reading, or read, "let us not tempt the Lord." Epiphanius also takes notice, that this text was very early corrupted by Marcion: who changed LORD, the ancient reading, into Christ. † So that it is exceedingly probable that our common reading is erroneous.

Psal lxxxxvii. 7. "Confounded be all they that serve graven images, worship him all ye Gods." Heb. i. 6, "And again, when he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith and let all the angels of God worship him." Although the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews may here allude to the expression of the Psalmist, "worship him all ye Gods," it by no means follows, that these words were originally spoken of Christ. In the xcvi Psalm we find the one true God represented, in all the majesty of his glory and power, manifesting himself to the world, and displaying his perfections. But the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of one, who had been dead; and was brought again into the world or raised to life, by the power of this one true God. Again, in the Psalms, it is the sacred person who speaks, and calls upon the Gods, or Angels, (who are styled Gods in the interior sense) to worship the one supreme God. But in the Hebrews, God himself is represented as bringing the first begotten into the world, and commanding the Angels of God to worship him, or be subject to him. This plainly discovers to us, that the Angels were not subject to Christ before his resurrection from the dead; and therefore that the passage in the Psalms is not applicable to him, in its strict and primary sense. If Jesus Christ had been the one true God, or equal to him, he would not have needed another to have subjected the Angels to his authority and dominion; he would have been the Lord of

† See Wetstein in loca.

of Angels, by his own natural and inherent right. By the Angels being here commanded to worship Christ, we are not to understand that they worshiped him as God: but only, that they acknowledged him as the Messiah, the anointed of God, the king whom God had set up in his holy hill of Zion, and had made head over all things to his church: and that they became under his direction, ministering spirits sent forth to minister for them who should be heirs of salvation. In short, the Angels being commanded by God to worship Christ, or pay him homage, denotes nothing more, than what is expressed in other places of scripture, when it is affirmed, " that God the Father raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places: far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named not only in this world, but also in that which is to come &c. Eph. i. 20. 21. See also Phil. ii. 9. 10. 11. 1Pet. iii. 21. 22. Some learned men have been of opinion, that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in regard to the passage we have been considering, does not refer to the Psalms but to the Septuagint version of Deut. xxxii. 43; where the words (*proskunēsate anō auto pantes angeloī Theou*) " let all the angels of God worship him," occur, and which are not to be met with in our present Hebrew copies. But whether this be the case or not, the meaning of the writer of this Epistle, can be no other than what we have before explained.

Psal. cii. 25. " Of old has thou laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish but thou shalt endure; yea all of them shall wax old like a garment: as a vesture shall thou change them, and they shall be changed." But thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end. This is quoted in Heb. i. 10. 11. 12. " And thou Lord in the beginning &c." The Trinitarians assert, that this passage is applied to Christ; and that he is the Lord who in the beginning laid the foundations of the earth &c. But if we consider attentively the manner in which this quo-
tation

tation is introduced ; we shall find that it is not applicable to him : but is only alledged to prove the stability of his Kingdom. The author of this Epistle having told us in the preceding verses, that the throne of Christ or the Son, is for ever and ever : and that because he had loved righteousness and hated iniquity, therefore God, even his God ; had anointed him with the oil of gladness above his fellows ; adduces this passage, in order to shew the certainty and stability of that throne or kingdom, to which the God of Christ had raised him. And thou O Lord, even thou of whom I had been speaking as the God of Christ, hast in the beginning laid the foundations of the earth &c. The kingdom of Christ may therefore be considered as resting on a solid foundation, seeing it was established by thee who art the author of all nature, whose perfections are unchangeable and eternal, and who shall continue to exist, when the Fabric of the Universe itself shall wax old and decay. All the other quotations in this chapter have prefixed to them. “ And to the Son he saith or “ Again,” which shews that the apostle intended an application or allusion. But this citation, is brought in abruptly without any preface or application, upon the back of another ; and after the Apostle had been speaking of the God of the Son ; so that it is far more naturally referred to the Father, than to Christ. In short, (to make use of the words of an able writer) this passage, “ seems to be a declaration of God’s immutability made here, to ascertain the durability of “ Christ’s kingdom before mentioned : and the rather so, “ because this passage had been used originally for the “ same purpose in the cii, Psalm viz. to infer thence “ this conclusion, ver. ult. “ the children of thy servants “ shall continue, and their seed be established before “ thee.” In like manner it here proves the Son’s throne “ should be established for ever and ever by the same “ argument, viz. by God’s immutability ; and so was “ very pertinently alledged of God ; without being ap- “ plied to the Son ; to shew how able his God, who an- “ ointed him, was to make good and maintain what “ he

“ he had granted him, viz. a durable kingdom for
“ ever.” †

Pfal. cx. 1. The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.” Mark xxii. 41 to 45, “ While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them, saying, what think ye of Christ? Whose Son is he? They say into him, the son of David. He saith unto them, how then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then call him Lord, how is he his Son?” Heb. i. 13 “ But to which of the Angels said he at any time, sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.”

In our common version, as well as in the Greek of the New Testament, there appears no difference in the Titles given to God the Father and to Christ in the cx Psalm. “ The Lord said unto my Lord.” This might lead an unlearned and inconsiderate reader to suppose, that they were both Lords in the very same sense. But in the Hebrew original, there is a striking difference in the language. The expression is there, JEHOVAH LADONI, that is to say, the sovereign, self existent, and independent being, said unto my Lord, the Messiah or Christ. The word ADON, by which the Messiah is here characterised, signifies any Lord or master what ever; and is applied to Potiphar, Joseph, and others, in the Old Testament. Christ was the Son of David according to carnal descent, and he is David’s Lord or Master, and is so called by him in the spirit of prophecy; not because he is, God, (as the Trinitarians absurdly suppose) but because he is the Christ, the anointed of God, the king of Israel, far superior to all the Prophets, Kings, and Legislators, who went before him; appointed by God the judge of the living and the dead; and exalted to a sovereign authority over Angels and men. The Jews were startled at our Lord’s question, because they were unacquainted with the true nature of the Messiah’s kingdom, and considered him only in the light of an eminent temporal deliverer.

† Emlyn’s works Vol. 2. p. 341

The

The ex Psalm is so far from favouring the system of our opponents, that it affords the most cogent arguments against it. It is Jehovah, that places LADONI, my Lord, or the Lord Christ, at his right hand, and makes his enemies his footstool. It is Jehovah, that sends the rod of the Messiah's strength out of Zion, and causes him rule in the midst of his enemies, and makes his people willing in the day of his power. It is Jehovah, that swears, and constitutes him a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec; and who at his right hand or attending upon him, strikes through kings in the day of his wrath, and judges among the heathen, &c. It is astonishing to me, that any person of knowledge or good sense, should ever have adduced any part of this Psalm, as a proof of the divinity of Christ or his equality with the Father: seeing every part of it is a demonstration of the contrary.

Prov. viii. 22 to 31. "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there were no depths, I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled; before the hills was I brought forth; while as yet he had not made the earth: nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world. When he prepared the heavens, I was there, when he set a compass upon the face of the depth. When he established the clouds above: when he strengthened the fountains of the deep: when he gave to the sea his decree, that the waters should not pass his commandment: when he appointed the foundations of the earth: then I was by him, as one brought up with him; and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him. Rejoicing in the habitable part of his earth, and my delights were with the sons of men. Because, wisdom is here figuratively described, as residing with God and attending upon him; and because Jesus Christ is called by St Paul, 1 Cor. i. 24. "The wisdom of God," therefore some of our opponents have imagined, that the wisdom

wisdom spoken of by Solomon, denotes Jesus Christ, and represents his eternal existence as a divine person in the Godhead. But if we consider the context, we shall find that no real agent or person is here spoken of, and that Solomon intended nothing more than to represent the attribute of wisdom as the spring of action in the Deity, presiding over his works, and ordering and disposing all the parts of creation in the most excellent and judicious manner. For in the beginning of this chapter, this wisdom is characterised as a female being, and coupled with understanding. "Doth not wisdom cry? and understanding put forth her voice? SHE standeth in the top of high places, by the way in the places of the paths: SHE crieth at the gates, at the entry of the city, at the coming in at the doors." Again Ver. 11. 12. "For wisdom is better than rubies; and all the things that may be desired, are not to be compared to it. I wisdom dwell with prudence, and find out knowledge of witty inventions, &c." From these passages it is evident, that the wisdom mentioned by Solomon is not a person or an intellectual being, but an attribute, property, virtue, or quality. It is indeed a most beautiful prosopopœia, or personification, but nothing more. But if it could be admitted that any real person or being was intended in this passage; and that that person was Jesus Christ: yet the cause of our opponents would derive no advantage from it. For this supposed person, is plainly distinguished from the Lord or Jehovah, and he is said to possess him; and although he is said to have been set up from everlasting, Ver. 23, yet this is explained and restricted by the words following, "from the beginning, or ever the earth was; which shews that a strict and proper eternity is not meant; but only that he existed before our world was produced. Yea, in ver. 25. it is affirmed, that he was brought forth before the hills; which plainly denotes that he is not eternal; but that he was produced or brought into being at some particular period; in the eternity that preceded the creation. It is proper to note here, that the septuagint translate, Ver.

22. "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way." Kurios ektise me archen hodon, that is, "The Lord created me in the beginning of his ways, &c."

Pro. xxx. 4. "Who hath ascended up into heaven, and descended. Who hath gathered the winds in his fists. Who hath bound the waters in a garment. Who hath established all the ends of the earth. What is his name, and what is his sons name, if thou canst tell." This passage, has been sometimes brought in to the controversy concerning the divine Unity; although it has not the smallest relation to the subject. Agur is not speaking here of God but of Man. It would be ridiculous to suppose Agur, to challenge the Jews to tell him the name of God. Every Jew knew very well, that the name of the God of Israel was Jehovah: Psal. lxxxiii. 18. "That men may know, that thou whose name alone is Jehovah &c." Agur here professes his own ignorance of the works of God; and challenges any person to produce him the name of a man, or the name of his son, who understood the whole system of nature, and could fully explain it. It is in this way that a learned writer paraphrases this passage. "Who is he among all the wise men, that ever went up into heaven and came down again, to tell us the order and motion of the stars.—Who but God hath tyed up the waves of the sea, that they should not exceed their bounds; and who hath fixed the earth.—By what name is he called, that can explain these things; or if he be dead, what is the name of his son or his family, that we may enquire of them."

Isaiah vii. 1. 9 10. "I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple &c.—And he said, go and tell this people, hear ye indeed, but understand not: and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert and be healed." John xii.

39 40:41. "Therefore they could not believe, because that Esaias said again, he hath blinded their eyes and hardened their heart; that they should not see with their eyes nor understand with their heart, and be converted and I should heal them. These things said Esaias when he saw his glory, and spake him. From these two places compared together, our opponents infer, that our Lord Jesus Christ was the Jehovah that Isaiah saw, filling the temple with his train &c. But in the first place, it may be said against this inference, that the expression, "his glory," may be more properly referred to God the Father than to Christ. For in the xxxviii: verse of this chapter St John had been quoting Isaiah liii 1. "Lord who hath believed our report, and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed; which passage certainly relates to God the Father, because the Prophet adds, that he (the Messiah) shall grow up before him as a tender plant.—Now this being the case, the words "his glory" must be considered as relating to the glory of that Lord, viz. the Father, of whom St John had been speaking before, and so the objection will be wholly removed. But secondly, admitting that the words, "his glory," are to be interpreted of Christ, it will not follow that he was the Lord of hosts that Isaiah saw; for Isaiah may be said to have seen the glory of Christ beforehand, by the spirit of prophecy, according to the observation of a learned writer. "These things said Esaias when he saw his glory and spake of him. The true meaning is; when Esaias (Ch. vi. 1) saw the glory of God the Father revealing to him the coming of Christ, he then saw the glory of him who was to come in the glory of his Father, Math. xvi. 27. Esaias, in beholding the glory of God, and in receiving from him a revelation of the coming of Christ, saw (that is, foresaw) the glory of Christ, just as Abraham (John viii. 56) saw (that is, foresaw) his day, and was glad." † But in the third place, it is necessary to remark, that the common reading of this passage is far from being absolutely certain: for there are four

S

Greek

† Dr Clark's works, Vol. 4. p. 58. Lond. 1738,

Greek Manuscripts, that either read, "the glory of God," or, "the glory of his God;" and two oriental versions render this place "the glory of his God," which readings, necessarily restrain the words to God the Father. †

Isaiah vii. 14. "Behold, a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Emmanuel." Math. i. 23. "Behold, a Virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel (which being interpreted, is God with us.)" The expression Emmanuel, God with us, does not denote (as we before remarked, p. 47. in the note,) that the child who was born of a Virgin, (viz. our Lord Jesus Christ) was God, or that God was incarnate in him, which is a thing absolutely impossible: but it means only, that God would reveal or manifest himself to his people by Jesus; and be present with him in a peculiar and extraordinary manner. Christ was the great ambassador or messenger of God the Father to man, and the Father dwelt in him and enabled him to perform all his miraculous works. — The Hebrew word EL also, makes a part of other names in scripture. besides this prophetic name which St. Mathew applies to Christ. Thus Elihu, signifies, he is my God, and Eliatha, thou art my God: but no body ever imagined from this, that the

† The Manuscripts which exhibit these readings are, the Leicester Ms. Gale's in the margin, Stephen's B. and the celebrated Cambridge Ms. which is of great antiquity; and which reads in the Greek part, "the glory of God," and in the Latin, "the glory of his God." The two oriental versions are, the Coptic, and later Syriac version. See Mill and Wetstein in loco. Dr Harwood was so fully persuaded, that the common reading of this place was erroneous, that he has changed it, and gives the text as follows in conformity to the Cambridge Ms. Tauta de eipen Esaias hote eide ten doxan tou THEOU, kai elalese peri autou, that is, "These things said Esaias when he saw God's glory, and spake of him." Harwood's Gr. Test, Lond, 1776:

the men who were so called, were really divine persons. In short the word Immanuel is no proper name of Jesus Christ: for we never find that he called himself so, or that any body else ever did in the Gospel history; and therefore it is only to be considered as declarative of what God would perform by him.

Isaiah viii. 13. 14. " Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself, and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread; and he shall be for a sanctuary, but for a stone of stumbling and rock of offence to both houses of Israel." Rom. ix. 33. " As it is written, behold, I lay in Zion a stumbling stone, and a rock of offence: and whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed " 1 Pet. vii. 8- " The stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner; and a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence &c." Because Jehovah, or the Lord of hosts, was a stone of stumbling and rock of offence to the Jews of old; and because our Lord is also declared to have been so to many afterwards; it is therefore sagaciously concluded by our opponents, that Jesus Christ is the Lord of hosts. But it should be remembered, that there may be more stumbling blocks than one; and that the same language may be applied both to God and Christ in very different senses, and in regard to different events. The laws and ordinances of the divine being, might be an occasion of offence or a stone of stumbling, to those who were not disposed to put them in practice under the old Dispensation; and in like manner the Doctrines of the Gospel might be equally offensive, to persons who had no relish for them under the new. But we are not warranted to infer from this, that these different causes of offence were one and the same. The sacred writers however have fully explained their own meaning; by distinguishing betwixt the stumbling block and him that laid it. Behold says St. Paul, (referring to Is. xxviii. 16.) I lay in Zion a stumbling stone &c. In like manner having the same passage in his eye St. Peter says, " Behold, I lay in Zion a chief corner stone, elect, precious &c. and afterwards he remarks, that he shall be " a stone of

of stumbling and rock of offence, even to them which stumble at the word, being disobedient." From the manner in which these two apostles express themselves, it fully appears, that the person who laid the stumbling block is the Lord of Hosts; and that Christ himself is the stumbling block that was laid by him; or the occasion of offence that was given; and consequently, that the conclusion of our opponents that Christ is the Lord of hosts, is not fairly drawn from the Apostle's words.

Isaiah ix. 6. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called; Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it, with judgement and with Justice from henceforth even for ever: the zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this."

The learned Grotius considers this prophecy as applicable to Hezekiah king of Judah in its primary sense, and interprets it accordingly; although he grants that there is a far more excellent sense in which it relates to the Messiah. I have no doubt myself that this prophecy respects the Messiah; and there is no difficulty in explaining it upon Unitarian principles. "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given." Jesus Christ was given by God as a benefit to mankind, he was produced in a singular manner, and appeared amongst men as the messenger of God. "And the government shall be upon his shoulder," that is, the government of the christian church, at the head of which he is placed by God. "And his name shall be called wonderful,, Our Lord Jesus Christ was indeed, a very singular and wonderful person, distinguished from all others by his supernatural birth, the number and variety of his miracles, his resurrection from the dead, and his exaltation in heaven." "Counsellor,, This character of the Messiah, may respect either his being intimately acquainted with the counsels or intentions of the Father, in regard to mankind, or it

it may signify, that he should give them the best and most salutary instructions for the regulation of their moral conduct. "The mighty God." In the original Hebrew it is *EL GIBBOR* which is more properly rendered "a mighty God," than the mighty God. If we consider the latitude in which the word God is used in scripture, and also the glorious dignity to which our Lord Jesus Christ was advanced by the Father, being appointed head over all things to his church, and the judge of all mankind; Angels authorities and powers also being made subject unto him: it will not appear at all surprising, that he should be called, "a mighty God," especially, in the bold, figurative, and highly poetical language of Isaiah. Moses was made a God unto Pharaoh, *Exod. vii. 1.* "See I have made thee a God to Pharaoh. "Angels are styled Gods. *Psal. cxviii. 7.* "Worship him all ye Gods." Kings and Magistrates are also called Gods, *John x. 34. 35* "Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, ye are Gods. If he called them Gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken, &c." These quotations make it evident, that there is an acknowledged inferior sense in which the word God is used in scripture; as denoting power, dignity, dominion, and authority. It is in this sense that the prophet Isaiah declares, that the Messiah should be called, "a mighty God," which means nothing more, but that he should be a mighty ruler or potentate; and is equivalent to what the prophet says before, that "the government should be upon his shoulder." "The everlasting Father." This is an erroneous translation. In the Hebrew text it stands, *ABI GNAD*, "the Father of the age everlasting," and is rendered in some copies of the Septuagint, *PATER tou MELLONTOS AIONOS*; † and

† The Vatican copy of the Septuagint, wants the expressions "wonderful, counsellor, mighty God, &c." and reads in place of them, his name shall be called *MEGALES BULES ANGELOS* the angel or messenger of the great council. The Alexandrian Ms. also wants the words
mighty

and by the *Volgate* in the same manner, *Pater futuri seculi*, the Father of the age to come; or the author of the Gospel dispensation. This is agreeable to what the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says, Chap. ii. 5. "For unto the Angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, wherof we speak." In the conclusion of this prophecy it is added, "the zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this" which indicates, that the child of whom the Prophet speaks, is a different being from the Lord of hosts. These words also prove undeniably, that the title of a mighty God, is to be taken in the inferior acceptation, seeing, it is not the child himself, but the Zeal of the Lord of hosts that is to make him, "Wonderful, Counsellor, a mighty God, the Father of the age to come;," and which is in short to perform every thing that is here prophesied concerning him. When these last words are taken in connection with the rest of the prophecy as they ever ought to be, this passage instead of weakening will be found strongly to confirm the Unitarian doctrine. There are some who laying aside the hebrew vowel points, render the words, mighty God, Father of the age everlasting, "the mighty God my Father for ever;" which is correspondent to the language of St. Luke, who seems to have, alluded to this prophecy Chap. i. 32. 33. "He shall be great, and shall be called the son of the highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his Father David. And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." †

Isaiah

"mighty God," but the Frankfort edition of the Septuagint, 1597, which follows Aldus edition reads, "THEOS ICHUROS," a strong or mighty God, and all the other versions in Walton's Polyglot bible have something equivalent to it.

† Bishop Lowth in his new translation of Isaiah renders.

Isaiah xxxv. 5. 6. " Behold your God will come with vengeance, even God with a recompence, he will come and save you. Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall sing." Math. xi. 4. 5. " Jesus answered and said unto them, go and shew John again those things which ye do hear and see: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear &c." God is said in the language of scripture to come, and visit his people, when he raises up any eminent deliverer to save them; and God the Father may be said with great propriety to have come when Christ appeared, because he came in the Father's name and acted by his authority; and the Father was the author of all Christ's miraculous works. John viii. 42. " Jesus said unto them, if God were your Father, ye would love me: for I proceeded forth, and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me." John v.

43-
ders, Chap. ix 6. 7. as follows: " For unto us a child
" is born; unto us a son is given;

" And the government shall be upon his shoulder:

" And his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsel-
" lor.

" The mighty God, the Father of the everlasting age,
" the prince of peace.

" Of the increase of his government and peace there
" shall be no end;

" Upon the throne of David, and upon his king-
" dom;

" To fix it, and to establish it;

" With judgement and with justice, henceforth and for
" ever:

" The zeal of JEHOVAH God of Hosts will do this."

This translation of the learned Bishop is extremely just, excepting that the words, " the mighty God", might have been more properly rendered 'a mighty God, as the original words are not Heel Haggibbor, which occur Jer xxxii. 18. but El Gibbor.

43. "I am come in my Father's, name, and ye receive me not." John viii. 16. "My Judgement is true; for I am not alone, but I and the Father that sent me. Verse 29. "And he that sent me, is with me: the Father hath not left me alone: for I do always those things that please him." John xiv. 10. "The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of my myself; but the Father that dwelleth in me he doeth the works.

Isaiah xl 3 "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a high way for our God. Math. iii. 1. 3. "In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea.—For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, the voice of one crying in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. Luke i. 76. "And thou child shalt be called the prophet of the highest: for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord, to prepare his ways. Math. xi. 10. Mark i. 7. Acts xiii 25. The observations of our Lord quoted in the last article, lead us at once to the true interpretation of these passages. God is said to come when Christ made his appearance, and John the Baptist is said to be the prophet of the highest, and to go before the face of the Lord. For as Christ acted in the world, in the name, and as the ambassador of the Father; and as the Father was ever present with him in an extraordinary manner: John the Baptist in going before Christ, may be very properly said to have gone before God.

Isaiah xl. 10 "Behold, the Lord will come with strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him. Behold his reward is with him. Rev. xx 12. "Behold I (Jesus) come quickly, and my reward is with me." It is not probable, that there is any connection betwixt these passages; but admitting that there is, it will prove nothing more, than that God will judge the world in the person of his representative Jesus Christ, whom he hath given authority to execute Judgement because he is the Son of man. John v. 27.

Isaiah

Isaiah xliii. 11. "I, even I, am the Lord; and besides me there is no Saviour." 2 Pet. iii. 18. "Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." This objection, is almost too low and trivial to be taken notice of. God the Father is eminently our Saviour, because, our Salvation takes its first rise from him; and neither Christ nor any other being, could have saved us, but by his permission and appointment. It was God the Father, that sent his Son to bless us in turning us from our iniquities; and therefore St. Paul affirms 1 Cor. i. 30. "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." Christ like an obedient son, came to perform the benevolent purposes of his Father; and as he is the person by whom our Salvation was immediately executed, he is more frequently than the Father styled our Saviour in Scripture. But the Father is our Saviour in the most sublime sense of the word; and is called by St. Jude ver. 25. "the only wise God our Saviour; and Jesus Christ is under him our Saviour in a true but inferior sense of the word.

Isaiah xlv. 23 "I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear &c." Rom. xiv. 10. 11. "We shall all stand before the Judgement-seat of Christ. For it is written, as I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God." The advocates for the supreme divinity of Christ, infer from a comparison of these passages, that Christ is the Lord or Jehovah, that swears by himself in Isaiah that every knee shall bow unto him &c. This inference however, will appear to be fallacious and ill-grounded, if we consider what is so often affirmed in the New Testament, that Christ is only the Instrument or Vicegerent by whom God will judge the world; and that therefore he cannot be that God by whose authority he acts, and whose person he represents. John v. 22. "For the Father judgeth

judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgement unto the Son." "He (God) hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." Rom. ii. 16. "God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my Gospel." These citations make it abundantly evident, that Christ will judge the world only by a delegated power from the Father: whereas if he had been God, he would have been the natural and sovereign judge of all the earth: and could not have received power from another for that purpose. Christ tells us, Luke, ix. 26. that he will "come in his own glory, and in his Father's, and of the holy angels." To bow and confess to Christ therefore at the general Judgement, is represented by the Apostle Paul as bowing and confessing to God; in whose glory and majesty Christ will appear; and by whose authority he will pass sentence upon all mankind, according to their works. In like manner, men are said to appear before the King, when they attend those courts of judicature, where judges preside that act by his commission and appointment.

Isaiah liii. 8. "He (Christ) was taken from prison and from judgement; and who shall declare his generation." These last words have been considered by the Trinitarians, as pointing at the supposed eternal generation of Christ from the Father's essence or substance; and have been sometimes triumphantly quoted as a proof, that this generation was an ineffable mystery that could not be unfolded in words; since the Prophet challenges any person to declare it. An eminent commentator on Isaiah however has shewn, that the meaning of this passage has been quite mistaken by our translators; and that it ought to be rendered from the original Hebrew thus, "And his manner of life who shall declare." His reasons for this emendation are extremely ingenious; and I shall give them at full length. "My learned friend Dr Kennicott has communicated to me the following passages

“ passages from the Mishna, and Gemara of Babylon, as
 “ leading to a satisfactory explication of this difficult
 “ place. It is said in the former, that before any one
 “ was punished for a capital crime, proclamation was
 “ made before the prisoner by the public crier in these
 “ words: — ‘ Quicumque noverit aliquid de ejus in-
 “ nocentia, veniat et doceat de eo, i. e. Whoever knows
 “ any thing of his innocence, let him come and declare
 “ it.” Tract. Sanhedrim. Surenhus. par. iv. p. 233.
 “ On which passage the Gemara of Babylon adds, that,
 “ “before the death of Jesus, this proclamation was
 “ made for forty days; but no defence could be found.”
 “ On which words Lardner observes, “ It is truly sur-
 “ prising to see such falsities contrary to well known
 “ facts.” Testimonies Vol. 1. p. 198. The report is
 “ certainly false: but this false report is founded on the
 “ supposition, that there was such a custom, and so far
 “ confirms the account above given from the Mishna.
 “ The Mishna was composed in the middle of the second
 “ century, according to Prideaux; Lardner ascribes it
 “ to the year of Christ 180. Causabon has a quotation
 “ from Maimonides, which further confirms this ac-
 “ count; Exercit. in Baronii Annales, Art. lxxxvi. Ann.
 “ 34. Num. 119 — “ It was the custom when a
 “ criminal suffered sentence of death, to remove him
 “ from the place of judgement to the place of punish-
 “ ment; and there went before him a crier pronoun-
 “ cing these words: This person goes to be executed
 “ in such a manner, because he was guilty of such a crime,
 “ at such a place, and at such a time. and these are the
 “ witnesses of the fact. If any one can prove him inno-
 “ cent, let him come and speak for him.” † Now it is
 “ plain from the history of the four Evangelists, that
 in

† The original Latin which I have somewhat curtailed,
 is in the quotation as follows. “ Auctor est Maimonides
 “ in Perek xiii, ejus libri ex opere Jad, solitum
 “ fieri, ut cum Reus, sententiam mortis passus, a loco
 “ judicii exhibet decendus ad supplicium, præcederet
 “ ipsum.

“ in the trial and condemnation of Jesus no such rule
 “ was observed : (though according to the account of
 “ the Mishna, it must have been in practice at that
 “ time ;) no proclamation was made for any person to
 “ bear witness to the innocence and character of Jesus ;
 “ nor did any one voluntarily step forth to give his at-
 “ testation to it. And our Saviour seems to refer to
 “ such a custom, and to claim the benefit of it, by his
 “ answer to the high Priest, when he asked him of his
 “ disciples and of his doctrine ; “ I spake openly to
 “ the world ; I ever taught in the Synagogue and in
 “ the Temple, whither the Jews always resort ; and in
 “ secret have I said nothing. Why askest thou me ?
 “ ask them which heard me, what I have said unto
 “ them : behold, they knew what I said.” John xviii.
 “ 20. 21. This therefore was one remarkable instance
 “ of hardship and injustice, among others, predicted by
 “ the Prophet, which our Saviour underwent in his
 “ trial and sufferings. St. Paul likewise, in similar
 “ circumstances, standing before the Judgement
 “ ment seat of Festus, seems to complain of the same
 “ unjust treatment ; that no one was called, or would
 “ appear to vindicate his character. “ My manner of
 “ life (TEN BIOS IN MOU, Heb. DORO,) from my youth,
 “ which was at the first among my own nation at Jeru-
 “ salem, know all the Jews : which knew me from the
 “ beginning, if they would testify ; that after the strictest
 “ sect of our religion I lived a Pharisee.” Acts xxvi. 4. 5.
 “ DOR (in Hebrew) signifies age, duration, the time,
 “ which one man or many together pass in this world ;
 “ in this place, the course, tenor, or manner of life. The
 “ verb DUR signifies according to Castell, “ ordi-
 “ natem vitam sive ætatem egit, ordinavit, ordine
 “ constituit.”
 “ ipsum — KERUX, Præco ; et hæc verba diceret : Ille
 “ exit occidendus morte illa, quia transgressus est trans-
 “ gressione illa, in loco illo, tempore illo, et sunt ejus
 “ rei testes ille et ille. Qui noverit aliquid ad ejus
 “ innocentiam probandam, veniat, et loquatur pro eo.”

“constituit.” In Arabic, “curavit, administravit.” ‡

From the light this learned writer has thrown upon this passage, and the happy illustration he has given of it; it appears that Isaiah intended nothing more, but a mournful complaint of the Injustice done to Jesus in his condemnation and crucifixion, without allowing him the privileges of his Country. “He was taken (says the Prophet) from prison and from Judgement: and his manner of life who shall declare.” The innocent Jesus was hurried from the place of Judgement to the place of punishment, without any public cryer attesting him: and without any opportunity of vindicating his character or making his innocence appear. The common forms of the Jewish law, which even the most notorious criminals enjoyed the benefit of, were violated on this occasion: and no person either appeared or was desired to appear, to speak in behalf of our Lord. From this explication of the passage, which is so just and natural, and agreeable to the proper signification of the word *Dor*, in Hebrew; all the inferences that used to be drawn from it in favour of an ineffable and consubstantial generation of the Son of God, fall at once to the Ground like the baseless fabric of a vision.

Jerem xxiii, 6. 7. “Behold the days come saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute Justice and Judgement in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called, “the Lord our righteousness,” (Heb. “Jehovah Tsidkenu, i. e. Jehovah our righteousness.”) This place has been often pompously brought forward by our opponents, as a proof that Jesus Christ is expressly called Jehovah, and that therefore as Jehovah is the incommunicable name of God, he must be considered as God equal with the Father. The learned Grotius however was so far from laying any peculiar stress upon this title, in the manner in which it here occurs, that he explains

‡ Bp. Lowth's Notes on Isaiah p. 240. 241.

explains this place of Zorobabel, and the restoration of the Jews after the captivity. There are some also who think this place ought to be translated, thus, "this is the name that the Lord (Jehovah) shall call him, our righteousness." But admitting the propriety of the common translation of this place, and also that it is rightly applied to the Messiah; the conclusion that our opponents form from it, will be found to be groundless and erroneous. For we find (in verse 5) that it is the Lord or Jehovah that is to raise up unto David "a righteous branch; and a king that shall reign and prosper &c." This branch and this king therefore, must be a different being from the Jehovah that is to raise him up; and must also be inferior to him and dependent upon him; because he is to be indebted to him for his kingdom and prosperity. Prophetic names are given in scripture to particular persons, not as denoting what these persons are in themselves; but as signs and evidences of what God will perform by them; or bring to pass in their time: thus, Shear-jashub signifies, "a remnant shall return;" and Maher-shalal-hash-baz, means, "In making speed to the spoil he hasteneth the prey." Now neither of these names, have any relation to the characters of the persons who were so called; but are applicable to events that happened at the time they lived. See Isaiah vii. and viii. chapters. In like manner, our Lord Jesus Christ being styled Jehovah our righteousness, does not denote that he was Jehovah; but only that Jehovah should make him the means of righteousness to his people; or should by him display his mercy and goodness to mankind; agreeably to what St Paul says, 2 Cor. v. 19. "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." And that this is the true interpretation of the place will fully appear if we consider, that the very same language is held in regard to Jerusalem, where the prophecy is repeated, Jer. xxxiii. 16. "And this is the name wherewith SHE shall be called, Jehovah our righteousness." There is therefore no more reason, for in-
fering

fering the divinity of Christ from this way of speaking ; than there is for inferring the divinity of the city of Jerusalem : and the same argument will be equally conclusive in both cases. †

Micah v. 2. " But thou, Beth-lehem Ephratah, tho' thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel ; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting. This passage has been adduced to prove the eternal existence of Christ. But it is by far too slender and precarious a foundation, to build so exceptionable a doctrine upon. The original words are " from the days of the age," which may be understood to signify, only a long indefinite period ; but by no means a proper eternity. But further, the Hebrew word *UMOTSATHA*, which our translators have rendered, " whose goings forth," may respect the descent of the Messiah, or the family from whence he sprung ; and is so rendered by an eminent commentator, who interprets this place of Zerobabel in its primary sense, so little did he imagine that any eternal duration was here intended.

" His

† Grotius observes on Jerem. xxiii. 6. as follows.
 " Dominus Justitia nostra : id est, Deus nobis bene facit ; nam *TSEDENK* Hebræis sæpe est beneficentia ; neque aliter hic sumit Chaldeus. Quod hic de populo Israelis, idem de civitate Hierosolymorum infra dicitur, xxxiii. 16. --- The Lord our righteousness signifies, that God will do good to us ; for righteousness in Hebrew often means beneficence ; and it is taken in this sense by the Chaldee interpreter. What is here affirmed of the people of Israel, is afterwards affirmed of the city of Jerusalem, Jer. xxxiii. 16.

Dr Clark has also the following remark on this place. " The name Emmanuel (God with us) and Jehovah *Tsidkenu* (the Lord our righteousness) and the like ; prove nothing more in point of argument, than even the names of places, Jehovah-Jireh, Jehovah-Shammah, Jehovah Shalom, Jehohan-Nissi.

" His descent is ancient, from distant times, that
 " is, he derives his birth from a house of illustrious
 " antiquity; who had been the reigning family for
 " five hundred years." † And this interpretation is the
 more natural, because the prophet speaks of one who was
 to appear at some future period. The Chaldee paraphrase
 renders this place, " whose name has been told, or men-
 tioned from eternity; from the days of the age;" and
 Calvin interprets it in a manner some what similar,
 " whose goings forth have been decreed from the
 days of eternity." But however this place is ex-
 plained, no argument can be raised from it to prove
 the supreme Divinity of Christ; or his equality with the
 Father. For the prophet affirms concerning the same
 person, Ver. 4. " that he shall stand and feed in the
 strength of the Lord, in the majesty of the name of the
 Lord his God;" which evidently implies, whatever the An-
 tiquity of himself or family may be, that he is a depen-
 dent being; and subject to the power of another. For
 if he were God he would stand and feed in his own
 strength; and would not need the support or assistance of
 the Lord his God.

Zech. viii. 9. " For thus saith the Lord of hosts,
 after the glory hath he sent me unto the nations which
 spoiled you; for he that toucheth you, toucheth the
 apple of his eye. For behold, I will shake mine hand
 upon them, and they shall be a spoil to their servants;
 and ye shall know that the Lord of hosts hath sent me."
 Some Trinitarians have asserted, that the person who
 spoke in this manner was Christ. But there is not the
 least foundation for such a supposition. It appears from
 the context ver. 3. 4. that it was one angel who deli-
 vered a message to another. The angel speaks some-
 times in his own character, and sometimes in that of the
 supreme being; but declares at the same time that he
 was

† " Origo ipsi (Zerobabeli) ab olim a temporibus
 " longis. Id est, originem trahit a domo illustri
 " antiquitus, et per quingentos annos regnatrice.
 " Grotius.

was sent by him. Arguments like these are hardly worthy of confutation.

Zech. iii. 1. 2. "And he shewed me Joshua the high priest, standing before the Angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him. And the Lord said unto Satan; the Lord rebuke thee O Satan, &c." There is no ground whatever to authorize the supposition, that our Lord Jesus Christ was the speaker here, more than in the last article. It is expressly mentioned that it was an angel who spoke, and who is called Jehovah, because, he represented him on this occasion; and this is the usual practice of the writers of the Old Testament, as we before had occasion to remark. That this angel was not Jehovah himself is evident; because, he prays to Jehovah to rebuke or punish Satan, for endeavouring to resist him.

Zech. xi. 4. 10. "In that day saith the Lord—— they shall look on me whom they have pierced." John xix. 37. "They shall look on him (Christ) whom they have pierced." It is inferred from these places by Trinitarians, that Christ who hung upon the cross and was pierced, was Jehovah. But, that Jehovah the self-existent and independent being, should suffer or die, is an idea too shocking and horrid to be admitted. And as St John expressly quotes the passage in Zechariah, "they shall look on HIM, whom they have pierced;" we are warranted by the best and most unexceptionable authority to suppose, that a mistake has crept into Zechariah, and that the original reading was the same as St. John has quoted it. A mistake of this kind might easily happen in the the Hebrew text, because, the letter Vau which signifies HIM; and the letter Jod, or Yod, which signifies ME, resemble one another very much; and thus might be confounded by an inconsiderate transcriber. But the two Greek pronouns AUTON and ME are very different, and it is not natural to suppose, that any mistake could happen in regard to them. And the words which follow in Zechariah render this conjecture still

still more probable; for the prophet adds "they shall mourn for HIM,——and shall be in bitterness for HIM. &c."

Zech. xiii. 7. "Awake. O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts." This text has been produced as a proof, of the entire and absolute equality of Jesus Christ with the Father. The original word GNAMITHI however, which our translators have rendered "my fellow," is far from denoting a proper equality. It signifies only, proximum meum, my neighbour, or my friend. The Septuagint render it, POLITEN MOU, my citizen, and the Syriac version has it, amicum meum, my friend. Abraham was called "the friend of God;" and good men are said to be, Eph. ii. 19. "Fellow citizens with the Saints, and of the household of God." Is it any wonder then, that our Lord Jesus Christ the well beloved of the Father, should be styled the friend, favourite, or neighbour, of the Lord of Hosts. But it is proper to observe, that at the same time that the divine being calls the Messiah his Neighbour, or his favourite, he calls him also, "his shepherd;" which marks a subordinate and dependent character; and signifies, that he had entrusted him with the charge of his church and people.

Mal. iii. 1. "Behold I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple: even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold he shall come saith the Lord of hosts." There are two messengers mentioned here, and the Lord of hosts is plainly distinguished from both. The first messenger is John the Baptist, who is said to prepare the way before Jehovah, (as we before remarked) because he was the Harbinger of the Messiah, who came in his Father's name, and acted by his commission and authority. The second, is the Messenger of the covenant, or the Lord Christ himself: styled HAADON, the Lord or the ruler, a title which may be applied to any Lord or master whatever; but is peculiarly applicable to the Messiah, on
account

account of the power and dominion the Father has invested him with. This Lord or ruler is said to come suddenly to his temple; or to that house of prayer which was solemnly dedicated to the worship and service of his God and Father: there to celebrate his name, proclaim his perfections; and publish the glad tidings of the Gospel to the world. This place so far from being any objection to our doctrine, supplies us with a good argument in favour of it; as the Lord Christ, or the governor that was to come to his temple, is distinguished in a clear and precise manner, from the Supreme Being or the Lord of Hosts.

We have now considered and replied to the objections of the Trinitarians founded on the Old Testament: or that ancient revelation which Almighty God was pleased to give his people the Jews. Although some of these objections, may appear plausible and specious at first sight to those, who have been accustomed to understand the scriptures in an erroneous sense: yet, none of them are solid; none of them are sufficient to shake the firm foundations, on which the Unitarian System is grounded and established. All the passages which give rise to these objections, are capable of a clear solution and satisfactory explication, without doing any unnatural violence to the language of the inspired writers: and many of them when recourse is had to the original text and the genuine reading; or when they are attentively compared with the Context, and the scope and intention of the writer, are found to confirm that Faith which they were supposed to destroy. In our next discourse, we shall produce those objections of our opponents which are supposed to occur in the Evangelists; and we doubt not but we shall be able to give an equally clear and satisfactory reply to them. Now to Jehovah the God of the Universe; the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; the God of Moses and of the Prophets; the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, be ascribed all glory and praise for ever, AMEN.

DISCOURSES ON THE DIVINE UNITY.

DISCOURSE IX.

John Chap. xvii. ver. 3. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

IN our seventh and eighth discourses, we considered and answered the objections of Trinitarians which are founded on different places of the Old Testament. We propose at present in conformity to the plan we laid down, to reply to those objections which are supposed to occur in the Evangelists. Some of these objections, being either quotations from, or references to the Old Testament, which have been already distinctly considered, we shall just barely mention, referring the reader to the places where the proper answers are to be found.

Math. i. 23. "They shall call his name Emmanuel, (which being interpreted is God with us.)" This place was explained, Discourse. viii. page 139 140.

Math. ii 2. "Where is he that is born king of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him." Jesus Christ is declared by the Evangelists, to have been worshipped by others, besides the Magi or wise men from the east; thus, the man who had been born blind worshipped him, John ix. 38; thus, the Apostles worshipped him, Luke xxiv 52; and in like manner the angels of God are commanded to worship him, or to be subject to him, Heb. i 6. An argument has been formed from these places, for the proper divinity of Christ. He must be God say our op-
ponents

ponents, because he was worshipped. But this argument is quite trivial; and rests solely upon the present acceptance of the word worship, in our language. This term in the original languages in which the scriptures were written, has a relative signification and meaning; and is indifferently applied to denote homage, respect, and obedience, both in regard to God and Man. See 1 Chron. xxix. 20. "And all the congregation blessed the Lord God of their Fathers, and bowed down their heads, and worshipped the Lord and the King." Here we find this word used both of God and King David at the very same time. In like manner, Math. xviii. 26. the servant that was not able to pay his Lord "fell down and worshipped him." In short the worship which was given to our Lord Jesus Christ was not divine or supreme; but inferior and subordinate worship, somewhat equivalent to the respect and homage that was paid to Kings and Magistrates. † The Magi worshipped Christ as St. Mathew informs us, as the native King of the Jews: the man born blind and the Apostles, as the Christ the anointed Son of God: and the Angels being commanded to worship him denotes nothing more, than their subjection to his authority after his resurrection; as head over all things to his Church: to which station he was advanced by the free and voluntary gift of God the Father; as a reward for his sufferings, and obedience unto death. Phil. ii. 9. 10. "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow &c."

Math. ix. 2. "Jesus seeing their faith, said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, be of good cheer, thy sins be forgiven."

† The word worship, was once used in this inferior acceptance in our own language; although now almost grown obsolete. In the marriage service of the Church of England, the husband is directed to say "with my body I thee worship:" and the chief Magistrates in public Corporations in England, are styled "Worshipful."

given thee. Ver. 6. " But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins &c." Mark ii 7. " Why doth this man thus speak blasphemies? who can forgive sins but God only?" Christ forgave sins on earth, in the same manner as he performed miracles by a power received from God. John v. 22. " The Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all Judgement unto the Son." And we find him praying for forgiveness even for his own murderers, Luke. xxiii. 34. " Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do;" which shows, that the power of pardoning sin did not naturally or inherently reside in himself. As God had imparted to him a knowledge of the human heart; he knew well, whether the faith and repentance of the persons with whom he conversed was genuine and sincere or not; and when he found them to be so, could pronounce with certainty that the persons were proper objects of forgiveness; and that their sins were actually forgiven by God. The Scribes (as their usual practice was) put a false and invidious construction upon our Lord's manner of speaking; but the multitude judged much more truly and candidly, " and marvelled, and glorified God who had given such power unto men " Math. ix. 8. It is not wonderful that Christ should possess the power of forgiving sins, when we find the same power afterwards conferred on the disciples, John xx 23. Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained."

Math. xi. 27. " All things are delivered unto me of my Father; and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him. The "all things," here mentioned, appear from the tenor of our Lord's discourse to relate to the doctrines of the Gospel; and the knowledge of God's dealings and intentions with respect to mankind; even those things which were hid from the wise and prudent, and revealed unto babes. If any thing else is included under the word ALL here,

here, yet as it is said to be delivered to the Son of the Father; it marks the supremacy of the latter, and the dependency of the former. If the Son were the true God, he would possess all things in himself and could receive nothing from another. What follows denotes, that none is acquainted with the office or destination of the Son, and what he is to do and suffer for the benefit of mankind; but the Father only: and on the other hand, that none knows the counsels or designs of the Father, respecting the salvation and redemption of the human race; but the Son to whom the Father has imparted them; and who alone is qualified and authorized to reveal or communicate them to others.

Math. xviii. 20. "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." This place has been urged, as a proof of the Ubiquity and Omnipresence of Christ; and consequently of his supreme Godhead. But if we look back to the verse immediately preceding, we shall see reason to interpret it in a different manner. Christ says Ver. 19. "Again I say unto you, that if two of you shall agree on earth as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is heaven." If our Lord Jesus Christ had been an omnipresent Being, he would have been ever at hand to have assisted his Disciples, and to have granted their requests: whereas he refers them here to the Father, as the person who could alone answer their prayers: and assigns it as a reason that their prayers would be accepted, that he himself should be in the midst of them. This leads us to suppose, that our Lord's meaning was only to signify to his disciples, that when they met together as his followers and servants, and offered their requests in his name, their prayers should be as favourably accepted and answered; as if he himself were personally present and praying along with them. It is in this sense that this passage is taken in the following ingenious explication of it. "If we consider the whole of this passage, in which our Lord is speaking of the great power of which his Apostles should be possessed, and especially of

“ of the efficacy of their prayers, we shall be satisfied
 “ that he could only mean by this form of expression,
 “ to represent their power with God, when they were
 “ assembled as his disciples, and prayed as became his
 “ disciples, to be the same as his own power with God ;
 “ and God heard him always. That our Lord could
 “ not intend to speak of himself as the God who hear-
 “ eth prayer, is evident from his speaking of the Father
 “ in this very place, as the person who was to grant
 “ their petitions.” † Christ may also be said to have
 been present with his disciples and first followers in their
 religious assemblies, in consequence of the gifts of the
 spirit which he received of the Father and shed forth up-
 on them, John xiv. 16. 17. 18. “ And I will pray the
 Father, and he shall give you another comforter, that
 he may abide with you for ever even the spirit of truth ;
 whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not
 neither knoweth him : but ye know him, for he dwel-
 leth with you, and shall be in you. I will not leave you
 comfortless ; I will come to you.” Here, Christ is figu-
 ratively said to come to his disciples, on account of the
 effusion of the spirit, which he was to procure for them
 from the Father by his prayers. Grotius takes notice
 that a person is said to be present with another in Latin,
 when he favours or assists him ; and that there was a
 common sentence or proverb among the Jews, very like
 to the words of Christ we have been considering.”
 “ Where two persons meet together and discourse con-
 “ cerning the law, the Shechinah is among them.” †
 Possibly, our Lord may have alluded to this proverbial
 saying, and if so, it will still more confirm the interpre-
 tation

† Familiar illustrations of certain passages of scripture,
 p. 26. 27.

† “ Sic Latine adesse alicui dicitur qui ei favet aux-
 “ iliumque prebat. Est autem hoc Christi dictum si-
 “ millimum triæ inter Hebræos sententiæ. — Ubi duo
 “ confident Sermone habentes de lege, Shechinah est
 “ inter ipsos.” Grotius in loco.

tation of his words above given. For the Shechinah or visible symbol of the divine glory, was not really present when two Jews met together in religious conference; but is only figuratively said to have been so, to denote the divine approbation of such meetings. In like manner our Lord was not really present with two or three of his disciples, assembling in his name, but only represents himself as being so, to signify that their requests would be granted by Almighty God.

Math. xxii. 45. "If David then call him (Christ) Lord, how is he his Son? See this explained dis. viii. P. 134. 135.

Math. xxviii. 18. 19. "And Jesus came, and spake unto them, saying, all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." These words of our Lord have been frequently alledged, in proof of a Trinity of co-equal and consubstantial persons in the Godhead; and are thought by some to be a clear and irrefragable demonstration of it. This conclusion however is entirely assumed and arbitrary, and has nothing in the words of our Lord to countenance or support it. Three, are here mentioned, but it is not said that these three are one God, that they are equal; or that they are of the same essence or substance. In regard to our Lord Jesus Christ, it may be proved from the very words he uses concerning himself in this place; that he is a person absolutely dependant upon, and inferior to the Father. "All power says he is GIVEN unto me in heaven and in earth." And can a person who receives all power from another, be God? Can the receiver be compared with the giver? Our Lord tells us, that "it is more blessed to give than to receive." As sure then as our Lord Jesus Christ received all power from the Father, (and that he did so we are certain from the testimony of many scriptures) so sure is it, by his own maxim, that he is a person inferior in dignity and excellence to

to the Father. The divine being was from eternity possessed of boundless and unlimited power, and cannot receive an addition or accession to his power from any. Who hath first GIVEN to him, (says St Paul) and it shall be recompensed to him again. For of him, and through him, and to him are all things, &c." Rom xi. 35. 36. But our Lord Jesus Christ has had power, has had ALL the power he possesses, GIVEN HIM, or conferred upon him; and therefore cannot be that God, or equal with that God, who gives to all but receives from none. But two questions are here put by our opponents. 1st. Why should Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, be joined with the Father in a solemn act of religious worship, if they are not divine persons equal with him, in power and in glory. 2dly. How can we be commanded to be baptized in the name of a person, if he is not God? To both of these questions, we shall give a distinct and explicit answer. To the first we reply, that the Form or Ceremony of Baptism itself, is not properly an act of religious worship. Neither prayer nor praise are contained or implied in the institution itself, although they may be very properly annexed to it. Baptism is an initiating ordinance, or ceremonial observance, that has an instructive moral meaning in it; and the form of words that are prescribed to be used, contain a short summary of the principal doctrines of the Christian Religion; but do not imply any appeal or address to the Deity. But further, it is no unusual practice in the sacred writers, to join God and the creature together in speaking of them, and that even on very solemn occasions, as will appear from the following passages. Exod. xiv. 31. "And the people feared the Lord, and believed the Lord, and his servant Moses." 1 Sam. xii. 18. "And all the people greatly feared the Lord and Samuel." 1 Chron. xxix. 20. "And all the congregation blessed the Lord God of their fathers, and bowed down their heads, and worshipped the Lord and the King" 1 Tim. v. 21. "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things &c." The two last

last of these passages are peculiarly striking. The people of Israel are said to have worshipped, the Lord and the King at the very same time, although no doubt they made a great and necessary distinction betwixt them in their minds: and St. Paul joins the elect angels with God and the Lord Jesus Christ, in a solemn adjuration; but had no intencion in doing so to lead any person to suppose, that they were equal in nature or dignity. To the second question we answer, that to be baptized in the name of a person is no proof that that person is God. For the Israelites are said to have been "all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." 1 Cor. x. 1. 2: and in Acts xix. 3. we read of persons that were baptized unto John's baptism. Now being baptized unto Moses and unto John, implies the very same as being baptized in the name of Moses or John. For a like form of speaking is applied to Christ. Rom. vi. 3. "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized (Gr. EIS) unto Jesus Christ, were baptized unto his Death? Gal. iii. 27. "For as many of you as have been baptized (Gr EIS) unto Christ, have put on Christ." From these two places it is plain, that to be baptized unto Christ, or in the name of Christ, has the same meaning: and consequently to be baptized unto Moses or unto John, must be equivalent to being baptized in the name of Moses, or John also. This being the case, it clearly follows, that there is no more reason for supposing Christ to be God, because we are commanded to be baptized in his name, or into the profession of the doctrines he taught; than there was for supposing Moses, or John the baptist, to have been divine persons, because their Disciples are also said to have been baptized in their names; or into the profession of the respective doctrines they also taught. That to be baptized in the name of a person does not imply that that person is God, may be further proved, from the question St. Paul puts to the divided and contentious part of the church of Corinth. 1 Cor, i. 13. "Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you, or were ye baptized in the name of Paul. This supposition

supposition of the Apostle would have been impious; if baptizing in the name of a person had necessarily implied the divinity of that person, in whose name baptism was performed. It is somewhat surprising, that we never find this form of baptism which St Mathew records, to have been afterwards repeated or made use of by the Apostles. Converts and Proselytes are said simply to have been baptized in the name of Christ, or in the name of the Lord Jesus. Acts, ii. 38. "Then Peter said unto them, repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost," Acts, x. 48. "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Acts xix. 5. "When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." See also Acts viii. 16. Rom. vi. 3. Gal. iii. 27. These passages have induced some to think, that baptism in the name of Christ alone is sufficiently valid; and that the words of Christ in St Mathew, are only a summary of Christian doctrines, but not a precise form or rule, that it is always necessary to follow. In short to sum up all we have said upon this subject: baptism in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, does not imply or suppose the divinity of any person here mentioned, but the Father alone, of whose sole divinity we are well assured from the uniform testimony of the scriptures: but it only signifies, the sincere belief, profession, and acknowledgement, of those doctrines, or of that religion, which the God and Father of all commanded and authorized his Son Jesus Christ to teach to mankind; and which he confirmed and attested by the Holy Spirit, or those miracles, signs, and wonders, which he enabled Christ and his Apostles to perform. This being the true and genuine explication of the passage in St Mathew: baptizing in the name of the Lord Jesus singly, may be considered as equivalent to the repetition of our Lord's words; inasmuch as acknowledging Jesus to be the Messiah, implies a belief in the one God and Father of all who sent him, and invested him in this office,

and

and also in those miraculous powers and wonderful endowments, by which he was qualified for the discharge of it.

In the conclusion of our seventh discourse p. 120 to 124 we made some observations, on the meaning of the words Spirit, and Holy spirit, in the Old Testament; and promised a further illustration of this subject, when we came to reply to the objections of our opponents in the new. This seems to be a proper place for introducing these additional remarks. That no argument can be formed for the divinity or equality of the Holy Spirit with the Father, (supposing him to be a person) from his name being joined with that of the Father, in the form of baptism, is evident from the observations, we have already made. But some may think that his being joined in this manner, with the Father and the Son, is a good proof of his personality. I am of opinion however, that the personality of the Holy Spirit cannot be proved from this conjunction. For to be baptized in the name of the Holy Spirit, appears to me to be equivalent to that other phrase in scripture, of being baptized with the Holy Spirit. It does not at all denote a person, but a gift, a grace, a qualification; and we find from a passage we quoted before, and which it is proper here to repeat, that the Holy Spirit or the miraculous powers, followed often as a natural consequence of Baptism, Acts ii 38. "Then Peter said unto them, repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the holy Ghost." The devout centurion appears to have been possessed of this gift, even before Baptism. Acts x. 47. "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost (or the miraculous powers) as well as we." This sudden effusion of the holy Spirit, seems to have greatly surprised the Jewish Christians. Acts x. 45. "And they of the circumcision which believed, were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was POURED OUT the gift of the holy Ghost"

St. Peter

St. Peter in reciting this transaction in the next chapter has the following remarkable words Acts. xi. 15. 16. 17. " And as I began to speak, the holy Ghost fell on them, as on us, at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the holy Ghost. Forasmuch then as God gave them the like Gift as he did unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, what was I, that I could withstand God." In all these places, the holy Spirit is called a Gift, but in these last words of St. Peter, it is called the gift which God gave: and the words of our Lord are quoted where he mentions, that the Apostles should " be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence." Acts i. v. " John the Baptist also, speaks of the Holy Spirit in the same manner," Math. iii. 11. " He (Christ) shall baptize you with the holy Ghost, and with fire." This way of speaking of our Lord, of his Forerunner, and of the Apostles, seems to me to afford a clear proof, that to be baptized in the name of the Holy Ghost, and to be baptized with the Holy Ghost, are expressions of the same import and meaning: and thus every argument for the personality of the Spirit, founded on the form of Baptism will be satisfactorily removed. And to us who live at a distance from those primitive times, and from whom the Holy Spirit in the extraordinary sense of the word, as denoting miraculous operations, may be said to be withdrawn; yet being baptized in the name of the Holy Spirit may still signify, all those divine aids and assistances suitable to our wants and infirmities, which as Christians we have a right to expect in the prosecution of our Duty. But it will be still objected, that the Holy Spirit is spoken of under strong personal characters, in some places of the New Testament, such as the following, John xiv. 16. 17. " And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know

know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." Ver. 25. 26. "These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you. But the comforter, (which is) the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." John xvi. 7. "Nevertheless, I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you." Ver. 13. "Howbeit, when he, the spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you unto all truth; for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come." It is also said of the spirit that he imparts spiritual gifts as he pleases, 1 Cor. xii. 11. "But all these worketh that one and the self same spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will." We are also commanded not to grieve the holy spirit, Eph. iv. 30. "Grieve not the holy spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption—in Rom. viii. 16. The Apostle says, "the spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God:" and Ver. 27. it is said of the spirit that "he maketh intercession for the Saints according to the will of God." And blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is declared to be unpardonable, Math. xii. 31. 32. "Wherefore I say unto you, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." Acts v. 3. 4. "Peter said to Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost——thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." These are the strongest passages, for the personality of the Holy Spirit

Spirit, that are to be found in all the New Testament. ‡ But so far as they favour this notion, they prove at the same time, that if there is such a distinct intelligent agent, that he must be a being entirely subordinate to, and dependent upon God the Father. For the Holy Spirit is described as the comforter, that the Father, is to send in consequence of the prayers of our Lord; and as he was sent by the Father, he must be considered as inferior to the Father, by whom he was sent. If the Holy Spirit had been God, Christ would have directed his prayers to to himself to come and assist his Disciples, and not have solicited the Father to send him. Again our Lord tells us concerning the holy spirit, (in the strongest passage of all for his personality) John xvi. 13. "He shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak" This marks in the clearest manner, the inferiority and subjection of the holy spirit (if there is such a distinct agent) both to God, and Christ. For it would be strange and impious language to hold concerning God, or a divine person equal with him, that he should not speak of himself; that is to say from his own judgement and knowledge; but that he should be taught and instructed by others what to speak.--Our Lord says further, John xvi. 14. "He (the Holy Spirit) shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you and Ver. 15. "He shall take of mine and shall shew it unto you." But if the Holy Spirit were

‡ Many Unitarians of the Arian denomination, have held the personality of the Holy Spirit; and some who have been Socinians in other respects, have yet followed the Arian system in this respect. The excellent and conscientious Mr Biddle, an eminent confessor for the truth, was one of these. He contended strongly for the personality of the Holy Spirit; but considered him at the same time, not as God, but as the first and most exalted spirit amongst the Holy Angels. The late Dr Clayton Bishop of Clogher, and the author of the Appeal to the common sense of all Christian People, have defended the same opinion. See the Essay on Spirit, and the Appeal, &c.

were a distinct agent equal with God the Father, he would possess all things of himself, and could neither receive nor take from another. Nor could the Holy Spirit, if he were such a distinct agent equal with God, be said to bear witness with the spirit of christians that they are the children of God, nor intercede for the Saints according to the will of God. For such actions cannot properly be ascribed to a divine independent being; but are only suitable and applicable to one, who acts a ministerial and subordinate part,—On the supposition of the distinct agency of the Holy Spirit we are not to understand that expression of St. Paul, wherein he affirms, that the spirit divideth unto every man severally as he wills; " as if the Holy Spirit acted sovereignly and independently: for our Lord expressly assures us in the words quoted before, that he shall speak, and consequently act, according to the directions he receives. If we attend to the context in St. Mathew's Gospel, as well as the parallel places, we shall find, that the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost therein mentioned, relates to the perverseness and inexcusable malice of the Pharisees, in ascribing the miracles of Jesus to the agency of Beelzebub the prince of Devils; instead of owning them as they really were, to be plain proofs and evidences of his divine mission. The Apostle Peter does not say to Ananias, that the Holy Spirit was God; but only, that in lying to the Holy Ghost he had not lied unto men, but unto God. For as the Holy Spirit was given by God the Father to the Apostles, lying to him was lying to God, whose messenger he was. In the same manner our Lord tells the Apostles, Luke x, 16. " He that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me." And all those passages wherein what is ascribed to God in one place, is in another said to have been done by the Holy Spirit, may be explained in the very same way. It appears evident to me from these considerations, that if there is such a distinct intellectual being called the Holy Spirit, that he can be no other than a creature or a production

duction of the supreme being, probably, the chief and most illustrious of those ministering Spirits, who are sent forth to minister unto them who shall be heirs of salvation. But at the same time I am far from thinking, that the passages above mentioned, afford a clear and positive proof of the personality of the Holy Spirit: or that they can counterbalance those many places of Scripture, wherein the Spirit is spoken of, as the power, energy, and operation of God. Wisdom is represented as a person by Solomon, (Prov. Chap. 8.) and is described as crying, putting forth her voice, and appearing at the gates of the city &c. Wisdom also is said to have been with the Almighty in the beginning of his ways, to have attended him in the works of creation, and to have rejoiced before him &c.—In like manner, Charity is spoken of as a person by St. Paul, and a great variety of actions are ascribed to it 1. Cor. xiii. 4. 5. 6. 7. “Charity suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not: charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.” Sin and Death are also personified in scripture Rom. vi. 12. “Let not Sin therefore reign in your mortal body.” Ver. 14. “For Sin shall not have dominion over you.” Ver. 17. “Ye were the servants of Sin.” Ver. 23. “For the wages of Sin is death.” Rom. v. 14. “Death reigned from Adam to Moser.” 1 Cor. xv. 26. “The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.” Ver. 55. “O death, where is thy sting? 56. The sting of Death is Sin.” In these places we find Wisdom, Charity, Sin, and Death, represented under personal characters. Now it is not unreasonable to suppose, that the Spirit of God, or the Divine Influences and Operations, may be personified in the same manner. In common Discourse we frequently talk of the Providence of God as a person, and say that it is the will of Providence, that such events should happen

happen: but no body ever supposed that Providence was a distinct agent in the Deity, or that it denoted any thing, but the divine Government and Superintendency of human affairs. Now the Spirit, or breath of God, in the original acceptation of the word, no more denotes a person, or intelligent agent than the word Providence does; and no Jew would have conceived the idea of any distinct agent by hearing it uttered. And it appears extremely probable to me, that our Saviour in representing the holy Spirit, or these divine influences, and miraculous operations; by which the Apostles were to be strengthened and animated, and the Gospel was to be propagated in the world, under the character of a comforter, or Advocate; had only recourse to one of those figures of speech, which were in common use amongst the Jews, and therefore could not be misunderstood by the Apostles. The Apostles themselves also, in imitation of their master, and agreeably to the practice of their Countrymen, adopted the same figurative way of speaking: but do not appear to have intended by it, to give any person reason to think, that they understood the Spirit of God to signify any thing else, besides the divine power and influences. For when the Holy Spirit is said to have descended upon any person or to have been imparted to any one, we never find any intelligent agent introduced or manifested: but only gifts, graces, and spiritual endowments conferred. In Math. iii. 16. The Spirit is described as descending upon Jesus like a Dove, or after the manner of a dove; and in consequence of it Jesus was fully qualified to enter upon his office, and enabled to perform all his miraculous works. In like manner St. John tells us Ch. xx. 22. that Jesus breathed upon his Disciples, and said unto them, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost:" which action of our Lord plainly denotes an influence or communication, but has not the smallest relation to a person. Again, the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the Apostles at the day of Pentecost, is described in the following manner. Acts ii. 2. 3. 4. "And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of

of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as of fire, and it sat upon them; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." The rushing mighty wind, the cloven tongues, like as of fire, here mentioned, and the spiritual gifts that were imparted to the Apostles, agree very well with the scheme of a divine *Afflatus* or inspiration, but do not at all suit the notion of a person. In many places of scripture the Holy Spirit is said to have been poured out, shed forth, distributed, &c. which is very applicable to a divine quality or influence, but would be strange language to be used concerning a person. See Acts ii. 17. 18. 33. Rom. v. 5. Tit iii. 5 6.. Heb. ii. 4. and vi. 4. It is a remarkable expression that is used concerning our Lord, by John the baptist, John iii. 34. "God giveth not the spirit by measure unto him;" which implies, that it was given to others in smaller portions, but was communicated to him in the largest degree. This way of speaking still more confirms our idea of the holy spirit. For a person cannot with any propriety be said to be given by measure, or in different proportions; but a power, a quality, or an influence may. But what above all other considerations, tends to establish our notion of the Holy Spirit, is this, that in many places of scripture, the holy spirit, and the power and operation of God, are used as synonymous expressions; and the one term is explained by the other. Luke i. 35. "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee." Here, the holy spirit and the power of God, are the very same thing. Math. xii. 28. "If I cast out Devils by the spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you." Luke xi. 20 "If I with the finger of God cast out Devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you" What Mathew calls the spirit of God, Luke terms the finger of God; which shews that the divine agency, is the only thing that is here intended. Luke xi. 13. "If ye then,

then being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children; how much more shall your heavenly Father give the holy spirit to them that ask him?" Math. vii. 11. "If ye then being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven, give good things to them that ask him?" Mathew here explains the holy spirit mentioned by St Luke, as denoting good things conferred by God the Father. Our Lord had frequently promised to his disciples, that he would send the Holy Spirit, or the comforter, to their assistance, and to supply his personal absence. He explains his own meaning in Luke xxiv. 49. "And behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you. But tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endowed with power from on high." This discovers to us, that the divine power was what our Lord intended, by the comforter or holy spirit. Acts x. 38. "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power; —for God was with him." In this place, the holy spirit and the power of God have the same signification; and God is said to be with Jesus because his power resided in him. 1 Cor. ii. 4. "And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the spirit, and of power." The demonstration of the spirit here mentioned, was the power of God, or those supernatural qualifications which were bestowed upon the Apostle; for the more effectual propagation of the Gospel. The spirit of God sometimes denotes the divine being, even the person of God the Father himself, as in the following places in the Old Testament, Gen. vi. 3. "My spirit shall not always strive with man," that is, I will not always strive with man, Psal. cxxxix. 7. "Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence." The spirit, and the presence of God here, mean one and the same thing, viz. God himself, Isa. lxiii. 10. "They rebelled and vexed his holy spirit." Num. xiv. 11. "How long will this people provoke me." And in other places of a similar nature, the spirit of God is

is to be explained in the same manner, as signifying God himself. The most remarkable passage of this kind is that in, 1 Cor. ii. 11. "For what man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him; even so the things of God knoweth no man but the spirit of God." This place seems to afford a decisive proof that by the spirit of God, we are not warranted to understand any being different from God himself. For the Apostle here compares the Spirit of God to the Spirit of man; and reasons from the one to the other. He would be a strange reasoner indeed, who should imagine that the spirit or intellectual faculty of a man, was a different agent from the man himself; and in like manner from the nature of the Apostle's argument, it must be equally absurd to conclude, that the spirit of God the Father, is a distinct person or agent from God the Father himself. And that the Holy Spirit is the spirit of the Father, is evident from the uniform tenor of scripture, which affirms, that it was given by the Father even to Christ himself while upon earth; and that he received from the Father after his resurrection and ascension, the promise of the Holy Ghost; and in other places we are told that the Holy Spirit was sent by the Father, and that it proceeds from the Father. But if any doubt could be entertained of what is so manifest, the following passages compared together, will afford a complete demonstration of it. Math. x. 20. "For it is not ye that speak, but the spirit of your Father which speaketh in you." Mark xiii. 11. "For it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost." Luke xii. 12. "For the holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say." The holy spirit is sometimes called the spirit of Christ, because the Father imparted it to him in the fullest manner; and because by the instrumentality of Christ, it was dispensed or shed forth upon the Apostles and first christians. But as Christ received it from the Father, it is manifest, that it can only be called his spirit in a secondary sense; and in strict propriety of speech belongs to the Father, and to him only. The holy spirit being then the spirit

of

of the Father ; and the Spirit of God being as strictly God (according to the reasoning of St Paul) as the spirit of a man is a man, every argument for the personality of the holy spirit, either as a divine person in the Godhead, or an inferior agent under God, seems to be effectually overthrown : unless it be assumed, that there are different kinds of Holy Spirits ; and that the Spirit of God sometimes signifies God the Father himself, and at other times a different agent from him. But this does not appear to be a just or natural way of interpreting scripture, and would lead to great confusion and uncertainty of explanation.

The Holy Spirit not being mentioned in several remarkable places of the New Testament, wherein it might have been expected that his name would have appeared, is a good negative argument against his personality. In the introductory addresses in the Epistles of St. Paul and others, we find Grace, Mercy and peace, wished from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ; but nothing wished from the Holy Spirit, and not even his name inserted. It seems to me extremely natural from this omission to conclude, that the Spirit is no person, but one of those gifts which the Father confers by Jesus Christ; and so is included under the articles of Grace, Mercy, and Peace. In 2 Cor. xiii. 14. St. Paul wishes the Church of Corinth, the Communion or participation of the Holy Ghost : but this does not imply personality ; and is a very different phrase from wishing a thing from the Holy Ghost. In the same manner the Apostle says 1 Tim. vi. 21. “ Grace be with thee ; ” but this does not imply the personality of Grace. St. John (Rev. i. 4) wishes Grace, and Peace, from the Seven Spirits which are before God’s throne ; but no person has a right to affirm that these Seven Spirits are the Holy Spirit : nor can it be said with certainty what they are. Again 1 Tim. v. 21. when St. Paul charges Timothy before God, the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect Angels, there is no mention made of the Holy Spirit. And in Heb. xii. 22. 23. 24. where all the inhabitants

inhabitants of Mount Sion, the city of the living God, are enumerated, God, Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant, Angels and the spirits of just men made perfect; still we find the name of the Holy Spirit left out. This would be astonishing to the last degree and utterly unaccountable, if the Holy Spirit were as Trinitarians affirm, a divine person equal with God the Father. An ingenious writer who defends the personality of the Holy Spirit, as an inferior agent under God, supposes, that the Holy Spirit is here included amongst the innumerable company of Angels; and that therefore there was no occasion for distinctly mentioning him, but this reason cannot be urged by any Trinitarian. Further, when our Lord says Math. xi. 27. "None knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any the Father, save the Son:" why should the holy spirit be omitted, who upon the Trinitarian system must know both the Father and the Son, as well as they can know each other. Again in Rev. v. 13. the following words occur, "Every creature———heard I, saying, blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the lamb for ever and ever." He that sits upon the throne is God the Father, and the lamb is our Lord Jesus Christ, but why is not glory ascribed to the holy spirit along with them? It seems the famous Trinitarian doxology is unknown in heaven, although so much used on earth. In the words of our text, life eternal is said to consist in the knowledge of the Father the only true God, and of Jesus Christ whom he has sent. But why is it not said also, to consist in the knowledge of the holy spirit? Many more places might have been alledged, wherein it was natural to expect to find the holy spirit named, but these are sufficient for our purpose. It is impossible to assign a reason for these omissions, on the supposition that the Holy Spirit is a divine person equal with God the Father; and it is not even probable that he should have been omitted so often, supposing him to have been an inferior being. But if we understand the spirit of God,

or Holy Spirit, in the true scriptural acceptation of the word, as signifying either God the Father himself, or the divine power, energy, operation, influence, or inspiration, this difficulty will be entirely removed. We now leave this subject, and proceed to the consideration of other objections.

Math. xxviii. 20. "Lo, I am with you alway even unto the end of the world." St Luke informs us, that our Lord Jesus Christ after his resurrection ascended into heaven; and Peter tells us, Acts iii. 21. that "the heaven must receive him, until the times of restitution of all things." He could not therefore be personally present with the Apostles after his ascension. But he must be understood here, as referring to the holy Spirit, or the miraculous powers and gifts, which he received of the Father, and shed forth upon the Apostles and first converts to christianity; and we are warranted to interpret his words in this manner, because he represents himself in another place, as coming to his disciples in this sense. See John xiv. 16. 17. 18. The original words, *heos tes senteias tou aionos*, may be translated, "even unto the end of the age;" and are by some restricted to the Apostolic age, while miraculous powers continued in the christian church: and the words of our Lord being directed to the Apostles themselves, seems to confirm this interpretation.

Luke i. 16. 17. "And many of the children of Israel shall he (John the baptist) turn to the Lord their God. And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias, &c." Ver. 76. "And thou child shall be called the prophet of the highest; for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord, to prepare his ways." For an explanation of these passages turn to Discourse viii. Page, 144. 145.

John i. 1. to 14. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made

made that was made. In him was life ; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness ; and the darkness comprehendeth it not. There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the light, that all men through him might believe. He was not that light, but was sent to bear witness of that light. That was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not. He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the Sons of God, even to them that believe on his name : which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we behold his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth." St. John begins his Gospel, in a manner very different from the other Evangelists : and various have been the conjectures of learned men, concerning his intention in writing this introduction to it. Some eminent critics have imagined, that he intended to condemn the opinions of Cerinthus ; but others equally respectable and discerning, do not think that the Apostle alluded to him or his tenets at all. Some have endeavoured to trace a connection betwixt the language of St. John concerning the Logos or Word ; and the doctrine of Plato and his followers : but others reject this notion, and consider the Apostle as having used this term, in a sense quite foreign and opposite to that of the Platonists. The Trinitarians have often adduced the first verses of St. John's Gospel, as a clear proof, and absolute demonstration, of the supreme divinity of Jesus Christ : and it is our business at present to shew, that these words of the Apostle afford no foundation for such an opinion.

It is not likely that St. John should have inculcated a doctrine of this kind, at his first setting out ; since in the course of his Gospel, he has furnished us with many
 unanswerable

unanswerable arguments against it. It is St. John that has recorded those discourses of Christ, wherein he declares, that he could do nothing of himself; that the Father who dwelt in him did the works; that he was not the author of his own doctrine, that the Father gave him a commandment what he should say and what he should speak; that the Father was greater than he; that the Father was in the words of our text the only true God; that he himself was his Messenger: and many other things utterly incompatible with proper Divinity. St. John also informs us towards the conclusion of his Gospel, that his intention in writing it was to ascertain the Messiahship of Jesus, or to prove that he was the anointed Son of God: Ch. xx. 31. "These (things) are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God." But according to our opponents, it was written to prove, not that Jesus is the Son of God in the scriptural sense of the word; but that he is the most high God himself. In considering this passage, we shall first give the Trinitarian interpretation of it, with a refutation; and then the different explications of Unitarians, both of the Arian and Socinian denomination. The Trinitarian is as follows. "In the beginning was the Word." Jesus Christ or God the Son existed when things first began to be created, and consequently must be eternal. Reply. If the Word here means a person, and that person is Jesus Christ; yet it will not follow that he is eternal, because he is said to have existed in the beginning of the Mosaic creation. If St. John had intended to establish the eternity of the Word, the Greek language could have easily supplied him with proper terms for expressing his meaning; and he would never have made choice of an expression which did not answer his purpose. "In the beginnings (says Moses) God created the Heaven and the Earth;" but this does not imply that the heavens and the earth were created from all eternity. In like manner the assertion of St. John, that the Word existed in the beginning, (if by the Word is meant Jesus Christ) will not prove that he
existed

existed from all eternity, or how long before the beginning of the world he existed : but it will only prove that he existed at that determinate period styled the beginning; or prior to the creation of this world and its inhabitants. " And the Word was with God." Here the Trinitarians differ among themselves; some understanding by the God with whom the Word was, their whole supposed Trinity, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and others asserting that the word God here means the Father. If they abide by the former explication, it will follow that the Word was with himself; which is a strange, ridiculous, and absurd way of speaking. If they adopt the latter, it may be very properly asked, why the Word is not said to have been with the Holy Spirit also, as well as the Father? " And the Word was God," that is say the Trinitarians, the Word or Jesus Christ was in the strictest sense God, equal with the Father. But here the same difficulty occurs as in the former clause. For if the God with whom the Word was, means the whole Trinity, as some of them say, then the Word had been sufficiently declared to be God before; and this is a needless and unaccountable repetition of the Apostle. To take off the force of this objection, those who adopt this interpretation say, that it is necessary to distinguish betwixt God considered essentially and personally; and that the God with whom the Word was, signifies the three persons in conjunction as existing in one divine essence; and when the Word is afterwards said to be God, here we are to understand God as described under a personal character. But this distinction will be found to involve our opponents in still further difficulty; for it supposes a quaternity in the divine nature; or that there are three personal Gods, and one essential God, which is absurd to the last degree and entirely unsupported by the scriptures. For the sacred writers never distinguish betwixt the essence and person of the divine being; nor can any person be supposed to subsist without a distinct and separate essence of his own. But we have sufficiently shewn the contradiction of this notion before, in the
conclusion

conclusion of our first and third discourses, to which we refer the reader. If our opponents then grant, (as many of them do, that the God with whom the Word was means the Father only, it is a natural consequence, that when the Apostle afterwards says that "the Word was God;" that we are to take the word God here in that inferior acceptation, in which it is sometimes used by the sacred writers. For it is the express and uniform doctrine of the scriptures, that there is but one true and living God; and that that one God is the Father; and as the Word is plainly distinguished from God and said to be with him, we are warranted by all just rules of interpretation, to understand the word God when applied to him in the inferior sense. And there is sufficient foundation in the language of the Apostle himself to authorize this explication, (if the Word signifies a person) as we shall shew more fully when we come to give the Arian interpretation of this passage. "The same was in the beginning with God." Here, the same difficulty we urged against the Trinitarians before, returns. Ver. iii. 10. "All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not." Here, say our opponents it is affirmed, that the Word or Jesus Christ made or created all things, and that he made the world; and as such actions can only properly be ascribed to God, he must be considered as a divine person equal with the Father. Reply. If the Word here means an intelligent agent, and is justly applied to Jesus Christ; yet as the Word at the same time is plainly distinguished from God, and is said to have been with him in the beginning when the world was created; the expression "all things were made by him," can only denote, that he was the inferior and subordinate instrument by whom the world was made. And that the original words δι' αὐτοῦ have this meaning, may be confirmed by the testimonies of two ancient Greek writers. Origen commenting upon this passage observes "The Phrase through whom," "never signifies the first, but always the second cause —

" All

“ All things were made through the Word; not by him
 “ (as the original cause,) but by one superior and greater
 “ than the Word.” † In like manner Eusebius says:
 “ When the Evangelists affirm that all things were made
 “ (DIA) by (or through) him, he therein declares the minis-
 “ tration of the Word to God (the Father.) For whereas he
 “ might have expressed it thus, *HUP AUTOU*, (all things
 “ were made by him as the efficient cause,) he does not
 “ so express it, but thus; *DI’ AUTOU* (all things were
 “ made by (or through) him as the ministering cause;)
 “ that so he might refer us to the supreme power and
 “ efficiency of the Father, as the maker of all things.” ‡
 It is evident then, that the agency of the Word (if a per-
 son) in the work of creation, can only be considered as
 ministerial; and that God the Father Almighty (in the
 language of the Apóstles’ creed,) is the proper Maker and
 Creator of heaven and of earth. Ver. 14. “ And the
 Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we be-
 held his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the
 Father,) full of grace and truth.” Here say the Trini-
 tarians, the Word is said to have been made flesh, or to
 have been united to a human soul and body; and is de-
 clared to be the only begotten of the Father, which im-
 plies that he was generated from the Father’s substance.
 Reply. The Word being made flesh, does not on the
 supposition of his personality imply, his being united to
 a human soul and body: for in that case Our Lord Jesus
 Christ would be two persons and not one; which notion
 we refuted in our sixth discourse, but it signifies,
 that the Word assumed a human body and became him-
 self the soul of it. The phrase only begotten in scrip-
 ture, is sometimes as learned men have observed, a mere
 Hebraism, denoting affection, and tenderness, and equi-
 valent

† Origen Com. in Johan. p. 55 56.

‡ Euseb. de Eccles. Theologia. The translation of this,
 and the preceding passage from Origen, is Dr. Clark’s,
 and is agreeable to the originals. The words in paren-
 thesis are inserted to make the meaning plainer to an En-
 glish reader.

valent to well beloved. But Jesus Christ may be styled with great propriety the only begotten of the Father, because he was immediately produced in a singular manner, by the power of God, without the instrumentality of any human ancestor, and this phrase has not the smallest relation, to any supposed generation from the Father's essence or substance. Having now sufficiently confuted the Trinitarian interpretation of the introduction to St John's Gospel, we proceed to give that of the Arians. "In the beginning was the Word." The Arians affirm, that the Word here means the person of Jesus Christ in his pre-existent state, and that his being in the beginning denotes, that he existed before this visible creation; but how long before say they cannot be determined: but they do not suppose him to be eternal, because St Paul calls him Col. i. 15 "the first born of every creature;" which implies that at some period or other he was produced or created. And the Word was with God " (Gr. HO THEOS, the God or the supreme God.) The Word, the great Messenger of the Father, the revealer of his will, (on which account that title seems to have been given him,) being the first, most glorious, and excellent production of the Supreme Being, resided with him, and had Glory with the Father, before any of the inferior creatures were made. "And the Word was God." (Gr: THEOS, a God, or God in the inferior sense.) This illustrious and exalted Spirit is called God, or a God, because he was the image of the invisible God, the brightest mirror and resemblance of the Almighty, the most dignified of his creatures, who frequently represented the person and majesty of the Supreme Being; and possessed a Godlike authority and dominion. The Arians observe, that the Greek article HO being joined to THEOS, when it signifies the Father, and withdrawn from it when it stands for the Word, denotes the supreme, absolute, and sole Godhead of the former, and marks the inferior and dependant character of the latter. And they are justified in this observation, by the testimonies of Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen

Origen, and Eusebius, who take notice of the insertion of the article in the one place, and the omission of it in the other : and assign a reason for it somewhat similar to theirs. Origen in particular observes upon this place as follows. " The Word was with God, " and again, the Word was God " John very carefully, " and as not being ignorant of the accurate nature of " the Greek language, sometimes uses the article, and " sometimes omits them : adding the article in the appellation, (ho Logos) the Word ; but in the appellation (THEOS) God, sometimes adding it, and sometimes, for distinction sake, omitting it. He applies " the article when the title God denotes him, who is " the unoriginated author of the universe ; but he drops " it when the Word is called God. He adds further, " He who is God self-existent is properly and absolutely " ly God ; wherefore our Saviour says in his prayer to " the Father, that they may know thee the only true " God. But every being, besides him who is God self-existent, receiving his divinity by communication from " him, is not HO THEOS, (God absolutely !) but may " more properly be styled THEOS (a God, or divine " person in the inferior sense."†) " The same was in the beginning with God." The Word was with the Father in the same manner, as one person is present with another ; before any part of the creation was produced, as before observed. Here the Arians remark very justly, that it is impossible that the Word can be said to be with God, and yet be the God with whom he was. This would be a contradiction in terms, and can never be admitted. Neither can the Word be said to be another God, or a distinct divine person equal with the Father ; for this would make two co-equal Gods, expressly contrary to the doctrine of the sacred writers, who assert that there is but one true and most high God, and that he is the Father, 1 Cor. viii. 5 6. But that the Word should be God, or a God, in the inferior sense, is attended with no difficulty, and perfectly agreeable to the

† Orig. Com. Ed. Huetii. Roth. 1668. Tom. 11. p. 46. 47.

the sense of divine revelation; wherein we are told, that this title has been given to Angels, Kings, Judges, &c. much more may it be bestowed, on the most eminent and illustrious of all the creation of God. "All things were made by him (or through him) and without him was not any thing made that was made." This implies say the Arians, that the Word was employed by the Supreme Being, with whom he was in his pre-existent state of glory, as an inferior agent in the formation of the world, and that he was the instrumental cause, by which all the different ranks of creatures were brought into being. "And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us. &c." This signifies say they, that the Word emptied himself of his pre-existent glory, and resigned for a time that exalted station he filled in the heavenly world, that he came down literally from heaven, and assumed a human body, being himself the soul or animating principle of it. And on this account he is called a man, because he was joined to a body of the very same kind that men are possessed of, and subjected to all the innocent infirmities of human nature. It was a wonderful and amazing instance of condescension, (say the Arians) in this illustrious Spirit to become a man; but there is nothing in this incarnation that is absurd, or impossible to be admitted. That a person possessed of the essence and attributes of God; who is eternal, immense, and omnipresent, should be incarnate, would indeed be an impossible and contradictory supposition; and therefore the Trinitarian system which contains this doctrine is deservedly rejected. But that the first and greatest of all God's creatures should undergo a change of this kind, to serve a grand and important purpose in providence; by rescuing the human race from the dominion of sin and vice; and restoring them to the true dignity and glory of their rational natures, may be believed without doing violence to reason, or the dictates of natural light. For altho' the divine nature cannot change, cannot be diminished, cannot empty itself, or be divested of its essential glory and
intrinsic

intrinsic excellence : but must always continue invariably the same : yet any derived, created, or dependent being, however exalted, may by his own consent, and the power and will of the Almighty, be transferred from a higher to a lower state of existence. This is the Arian interpretation of the introduction to St. John's Gospel, and is the most literal one the words are capable of : and if the beginning there mentioned, means the beginning of the creation, and the Logos or Word is applicable to the person of Jesus Christ, it must be received as the only genuine explication of the passage.

I shall now give the Socinian interpretation of these verses. " In the beginning was the Word." The Socinians, (or those who maintain the strict and proper humanity of Christ, which is what is meant by the appellation ; and not that they follow all the opinions of Socinus) now generally admit, that " the beginning " refers to the beginning of the creation. † But they do not apprehend, that the Logos or Word mentioned by St. John signifies a person, or intelligent agent, but they conceive that it is only a Mode, Quality, or Attribute in the Deity ; or in short a description of the one true God the Father himself, after the Hebrew manner, founded on the original language of the sacred writers of the Old Testament, in
the

† Those excellent Christians, the Unitarians of Poland and Transylvania, adopted the interpretation of Socinus, and referred the beginning mentioned by St. John ; not to the beginning of the creation ; but the beginning of the Gospel, that is, when John the baptist began to preach repentance to the Jews ; which St. Mark Ch. i. 1 expressly calls the beginning of the Gospel. They interpreted the whole passage of the new creation, or moral renovation of the world, by Jesus Christ. Their interpretation, as some of them have explained and enforced it is ingenious ; and by no means deserving the contempt or ridicule, that Abp. Tillotson, and Bp. Stillingfleet, have endeavoured to throw upon it. It has however of late years, found few or no patrons in this part of the World.

the following passages — Gen i. 1. " In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." — Ver 3 " God said let there be light and there was light." Psal. xxxiii. 6. " By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth." Ver. 9 " For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast." Psal. cv. 19 " Until the time that his word came: the word of the Lord tried him." It is further observed in favour of this interpretation, that it appears from the Targums or Chaldee Paraphrases, that it was a current way of speaking among the Jews, to put the *Mimra* Jehovah, or Word of the Lord, for God himself. These paraphrases are granted by learned men to be of great Antiquity; and as they were made for the use of the common people among the Jews, who after the Babylonish captivity had in a great Measure forgotten the original Hebrew; this Phraseology must have been in common use with them long before. We shall produce a few passages from these paraphrases as a specimen of this manner of expression. Gen. i. 27. " God created man," is rendered by the Jerusalem Targum, " the (*Mimra*) or Word of the Lord created man." Gen. iii. 8. " They heard the voice of the Lord God," rendered in the paraphrase of Onkelos. " They heard the voice of the word of the Lord God." Gen. ix. 12. " And God said this is the token of the covenant which I make between me and you." paraphrased by Onkelos, " between (*my Mimra*) or my word and you." Gen. xv. 6. " And he (*Abraham*) believed in the Lord." Onkelos, " in the word of the Lord." Gen. xxi. 23. " Now therefore swear unto me here by God. Onkelos. " The word of the Lord." Exod. xiv. 32. " The people—believed the Lord. Onkelos. " In the word of the Lord." Exod. xvi. 8. " Your murmurings are not against us, but against the Lord " Onkelos " the word of the Lord Num. xiv. 9. " Rebell not ye against the Lord." Onkelos. " The word of the Lord." Isa. xiv. 12. " I have made the earth and created man upon it, saith the Lord Jonathan's Targum. " I by my word made the earth, &c." Isa. xlviii. 13. " My.

13. "My hand also founded the earth." Jonathan. "By my word also I founded the earth." These are only a few out of a vast number of places, wherein the Chaldee paraphrasts render Jehovah or the Lord in Hebrew, by the word of the Lord in their translations; which seems to prove, that this way of speaking, was only an idiom or peculiarity of the language in which they wrote: and was not intended to denote any other being, besides Jehovah the God of Israel himself. — And the following passages in which this form of expression is applied to human beings, confirms this idea still more. Num. xv. 32. "They found a man that gathered sticks upon the sabbath day. Jonathan. "There arose a man of the house of Joseph, and said IN HIS WORD, I will go and gather sticks on the sabbath day. Eccles xii. 8 "Vanity of vanities, saith the preacher, all is vanity." Paraphrase. When Solomon king of Israel, contemplated the vanity of this World; and the vain actions which men perform in it: the preacher said IN HIS WORD, all is vanity. Now say the Socinians, as it appears from the Old Testament and the Jewish Targums or translations of it; that the ancient Hebrews used the word of God, as another term for God himself; † it is natural to think that St John imitated the practice of his countrymen in this respect: and it is far more reasonable to interpret the Logos, or Word in this sense, than to take it in the acceptation of Platonists, or Heathen Philosophers; with whom St John had no connection, and whose language he cannot be supposed to have followed. The advocates there-

fore
 † It has been urged by Trinitarians, as a proof that the Chaldee paraphrasts understood a person by the Word, that in Psal. cx. 1. they translate, "The Lord said unto my Lord: as follows. "The Lord said to his Word; but this place is rendered in the Latin translations of both Targum's, in Walton's Polyglot bible, Dixit Dominus in verbo suo, i. e. The Lord said in or by his Word; that is in or by himself, which entirely removes this objection.

fore for the proper humanity of Christ, consider this place of St John's Gospel, as a figurative description of God the Father himself, in the Jewish style, creating the World by his Power, Wisdom, Will, or Word; which Word was in the beginning with him; and was not any person or agent different from him; but was God himself, as the Apostle affirms. By this Word, will, or command of God, was every part of the creation formed, or produced. And this Word afterwards was made flesh, or dwelt in the person of Jesus Christ; and is synonymous to the Spirit or power of God, which we are so often told resided in him; and enabled him to perform all his miraculous works. This interpretation will appear the more natural, if we examine and compare it, with the Old English Version that was in use in Queen Elizabeth's time. That translation reads, John 1. i. 2, 3, 4, and 14, as follows "In the beginning was
 " the Word, and the Word was with God, and God
 " was that Word. The same was in the beginning with
 " God. All things were made by *IT*, and without *IT*,
 " was made nothing that was made. In *IT* was life,
 " and the life was the light of men. And the same
 " Word became flesh, and dwelt among us (and we saw
 " the glory of *IT*, as the glory of the only begotten Son
 " that came from the Father) full of grace and truth."

There are many who think that St John here alludes to Pro. viii. 22. wherein Solomon introduces Wisdom in beautiful metaphorical language, as a person residing with the Almighty in the beginning of his ways; and attending him in the creation of every part of nature. Jeremiah likewise speaking of the Divine Being says Ch. x. 12. "He hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by his discretion. It has also been remarked, that the term *Logos* may be more properly translated, Reason or Wisdom, than the Word; agreeably to the observation of Tertullian, who speaking of God prior to the creation, has the following words. "For before all
 " things God existed alone, without the world, space or
 " any

“ any thing else. He was alone, because nothing exter-
 “ nal or besides himself, was in being. But neither
 “ then was he alone for he had with him his Reason,
 “ which he had within himself. God is rational
 “ also, and Reason was before in him; and so all
 “ things were of him. Which reason is his sense or
 “ understanding. This the Greeks call *Logos*, which
 “ word also we use to express *Sermo*. And therefore
 “ it is become the common custom among us, through
 “ a simplicity of interpretation (i. e. an unskilfulness in
 “ interpreting) to say, that speech or discourse, (*Sermo*)
 “ was in the beginning with God, whereas it would be
 “ more proper to say, that Reason was so which is more
 “ ancient; because God was in the beginning not (*Ser-*
 “ *monialis*,) but rational, even before the beginning; and
 “ because speech or discourse itself depending upon Rea-
 “ son, does shew that to be prior to it, as its substan-
 “ ce, &c. § An eminent commentor taking *Logos* in
 this sense as denoting the Divine Reason, translates and
 paraphrases the first fourteen verses of St John's Gospel,
 in the following manner:

“ 1. In the beginning was Reason, and that Reason
 “ was with God, and God was that Reason. 1. It is true,
 “ before the creation of the world, there was Reason,
 “ for Reason, was then in God, yea God himself, since
 “ God cannot be without Reason. 2. The same was in
 “ the beginning with God. 2. There was, I say, Reason
 “ in God, before the world was created. 3. All things
 “ were made by it, and without it was not any thing made
 “ that was made. 3. For every thing in the world
 “ was made with the highest Reason; nor can any one
 “ thing be produced, that was created without Reason.
 “ 4. In it was life, and this life was the light of men.

4. Formerly

§ *Ante omnia enim Deus erat solus, ipse sibi et mundus*
 “ *et locus et omnia. Solus autem quia nihil aliud ex-*
 “ *trinsecus præter illum. Ceterum, ne tunc quidem*
 “ *solus; habebat enim secum, quam habebat in semetipso;*
 “ *Rationem suam scilicet. Rationalis etiam Deus, et*
 “ *Ratio*

“ 4. Formerly there was lodged only in this reason, a
 “ full and complete knowledge of the way that leads
 “ to eternal life; and this knowledge wanted only to
 “ be communicated to Men, to be a clear and sufficient
 “ light to guide them in their pursuit after that Life.
 “ 5. And the Light shineth in darkness, and the dark-
 “ ness comprehendeth it not. 5. And now that light
 “ has been brought down upon earth, amongst Men,
 “ and has shined for many years past upon the way
 “ that leads to Life; but the greatest part of Mankind
 “ chuse rather to wander in the darkness of igaor-
 “ ance, than to make use of that light, 6. There
 “ was a man sent from God, his name was John, 7.
 “ The same came for a witness, to bear witness of
 “ the light, that all men through him might believe.
 “ 6. 7. John the Son of Zacharias was sent by God
 “ to the Jews, to shew them in whom that light
 “ resided, and by bearing witness to him openly, to in-
 “ duce them to believe on him. 8 He was not the
 “ Light, but was sent to bear witness of the Light, 8.
 “ But John had not this Light in himself, nor was it
 “ the end of his coming, to make men partakers of that
 “ Light; but only by his testimony to procure credit
 “ and authority to him who had that Light among the
 “ Jews. 9. That Light was the true Light, which came
 “ into the world, and enlighteneth every Man. 9. In
 “ that Man, and no other resided this Light, which in
 “ the most excellent sense deserves only to be so called,
 “ and which now shines among Men; so that every one
 who
 “ Ratio in ipso prius; et ita, ab ipso omnia. Quæ Ratio
 “ Sensus ipseus est. Hanc Græci *Logon* dicunt, quo
 “ vocabulo etiam Sermonem appellamus. Ideoque jam
 “ in usu est nostrorum, per simplicitatem interpretationis,
 “ Sermonem dicere in primordio apud Deum fuisse;
 “ cum magis Rationem competat antiquiorem haberi;
 “ quia non sermonealis a principio, sed rationalis Deus
 “ etiam ante principium; et quia ipse quoque sermo
 “ Ratione consistens, priorem eam ut substantiam suam
 “ ostendat, &c Tertullian. adv. Praxeam Cap. v.
 p. 502, 503. Ed. Rigaltii. Parisiis. 1695.

“ who will but follow this light, may be sure of being
 “ brought to eternal Life. 10. Reason was in the World,
 “ and the World was made by it, but the World knew
 “ it not. 10. And he in whom that light was, conversed
 “ for sometime among men; but they notwithstanding
 “ there having been created by the divine reason which
 “ dwelt in that Man, did not distinguish him from false
 “ teachers. 11. It came to its own, but its own received
 “ it not. 11. Nay he lived among those who alone were
 “ called the people and children of God, and yet they
 “ did not know the doctrine of their God 12. But to as
 “ many as received it, it gave power to become the Sons
 “ of God, even to them that believe on its name 12. But
 “ all that embraced his divine doctrines, became in con-
 “ sequence the people of God, and were received, al-
 “ though they were not Jews, into the number of his
 “ children 13. Who were born not of blood, nor of the
 “ will of the Flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.
 “ 13. Tho’ they were not Jews by Birth, nor by Mar-
 “ riage, nor Proselytes, yet God was pleased freely to
 “ honour them with that title. 14. And that Reason
 “ was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld
 “ its glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Fa-
 “ ther) full of Grace and Truth. 14. That Reason
 “ which I before spake of, and asserted to have been with
 “ God from the beginning, yea to have been God him-
 “ self and in which was life and the light of men, did
 “ not always, as I said, conceal itself from us; but by the
 “ Man in whom it was, became conspicuous, and dwelt
 “ for sometime among us. (We saw the Majesty of the
 “ Divine Reason which was never before beheld
 “ discovering itself in that man, as it became him who is
 “ the Son of God, not in that manner that we are, but
 “ in a manner peculiar and proper to himself alone.)
 “ That Eternal Reason made itself visible and manifest
 “ to us in him, and shewed itself merciful and gracious
 “ to us.” † Another ingenious writer, and strenuous ad-
 vocate for the divine unity, paraphrases these verses in

the

† Le Clerc in loco.

the following manner. "The Greek term which we have translated the word, does also signify reason, intelligence, wisdom. This makes much better sense than the other, since it is more suitable to the divine nature, which is purely spiritual; and to which speech cannot be properly applied. This being settled, the intention of St. John in my opinion, is to inform us, that the same wisdom which at first formed the natural world of creatures with such admirable art, has been equally conspicuous in the creation of the new or moral world. This thought is truly noble, and conveys a sublime Idea of the Gospel. To make it appear in its full lustre, let us attend minutely to the language of the Evangelist. In the beginning was the word, that is, there is an eternal intelligence, a sovereign wisdom, which has existed before all time. "And the Word was with God or in God," that denotes, that wisdom has always been inseparably united to the Deity, and that it resides in him as its true and only source. This is correspondent to that fine figure in the viii. chapter of the Proverbs, where Wisdom is introduced speaking in this manner; "the Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way;" that is, I am his most distinguished ornament, his constant and invariable companion. And last we should be apt to fall into the erroneous opinion of the Pagans, who made this virtue a Minerva, a divine person different from their chief God, St. John explains his own meaning with the utmost precision, and adds, that Wisdom is not a thing distinct from God himself "the word was God." After having defined the nature of this Wisdom, he proceeds to consider it in its effects. And in order to come at these the more naturally, he repeats his first assertion. "In the beginning then Wisdom was with God, and all things were made by her." The expression is truly energetic, and implies a great deal more than is expressed. God consults his wisdom, and immediately the fabric of creation emerges from

" Chaos. This truth, although of the last importance,
 " was formerly unknown even to the most enlightened
 " Philosophers: the greatest part of whom believed,
 " that the world existed without a cause, and that all
 " things were made without reason, and by chance.
 " The Apostle refutes so capital an error, and declares,
 " that " all things were made by reason." Indeed, if
 " ever there was a plan well conceived, if ever there
 " was a work in which art and Understanding were
 " displayed, it is undoubtedly in the structure of the
 " Universe. The characters of consummate wisdom are
 " apparent in every part of it. To ascribe so much
 " order to chance, effects so constant and regular to
 " mere caprice, is to associate the most incompatible
 " Ideas, and to renounce even reason itself. Sooner
 " might it be supposed that stones falling casually from
 " the top of a rock, should form a handsome edifice at
 " the bottom of it; than that the blind and unintelli-
 " gent parts of matter should produce, I will not say
 " the Universe, but even a single creature such as man.
 " In vain would you put these atoms in motion: with-
 " out the interposition of wisdom nothing but wild
 " confusion would ensue; " without her nothing which
 " has been made could have been made." We come
 " now to the last period of the word; and St. John
 " arrives at his principal proposition, and that which he
 " intended as the subject of his history: " the word was
 " made flesh." Before we give the true meaning of it,
 " let us first remove one erroneous idea. Properly
 " speaking, Wisdom did not become flesh; the Deity
 " did not transform himself into a man: this is contra-
 " dictory to all just conceptions of things. How shall
 " we then understand the phrase; " Wisdom was made
 " flesh?" We cannot have a better interpreter than
 " St Paul; who tells us that God was manifest in the
 " flesh. † This passage is perfectly parallel with St
 " John's words, who intended to say nothing else, but
 " that wisdom was entirely manifested; that she be-
 " came sensible or visible, as it were, in the person of

† 1 Tim, iii. 16.

" Jesus

“ Jesus Christ: and that this wisdom appeared in his
 “ doctrine, in his discourses, and in every part of his
 “ conduct. On this account he is called the image of
 “ the invisible God, because the perfections of the Deity
 “ were observed to shine forth in him: and if wisdom
 “ discovered herself in the works of creation, it may be
 “ affirmed, that she was still more conspicuously display-
 “ ed by the Gospel. “ She dwelt among us full of grace
 “ and truth,” which means, that she was incessantly
 “ employed in performing benevolent actions to man-
 “ kind, by illuminating their understandings, and
 “ supplying them with every thing necessary to salvari-
 “ on: “ and we beheld his glory, a glory becoming
 “ the only begotten of the Father.” This glory appear-
 “ ed in the miracles of Jesus Christ, in his resurrection,
 “ and in his ascension into heaven: a glory far surpass-
 “ ing that of Moses and the Prophets; but yet no
 “ more than was suitable to the dignity of the only son
 “ of God, who was produced by his Father in a mir-
 “ aculous way, and sent by him with an extraordinary
 “ power and authority to men † in this manner the
 Socinians interpret the introduction to St John’s Gospel;
 and the passage can only be understood in this sense, or in
 that of the Arians; for the Trinitarian exposition is in
 all respects absurd, and evidently contrary to the scope and
 intention of the Evangelist, as well as the general tenor
 of scripture. § We now pass from this subject to the
 consideration of other objections.

John i. 18. “ No man hath seen God at any time;
 the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Fa-
 ther, he hath declared him.” The term MONOGENOUS,
 only begotten, does not in the smallest manner relate to
 any

† *Oeuvres diverses de Mon. Abauzit.*

§ Mr Lindsey to his Sequel to his Apology, and in his
 Catechist, has advanced many excellent things in con-
 firmation of the Socinian interpretation of the introduc-
 tory verses of St John’s Gospel; which highly deserve
 the attention of every serious and inquisitive christian.

any supposed eternal generation : but either respects the miraculous production of Jesus by the power of God ; or is equivalent to the term beloved, and well beloved, so often used by the other Evangelists concerning our Lord. Compare with this place of St John Math. iii. 17. xvi. 5. Mark i. 11. ix. 7. Luke iii. 22. ix. 35. 2. Pet. i. 17. In like manner, Heb. xi. 17. Isaac is styled Abraham's only begotten or well beloved son ; although Abraham had other children besides him by Hagar and Keturah. The phrase, " who is in the bosom of the Father," may be understood in the same way, viz. that Jesus was the object of the Father's peculiar affection and regard : or it may signify that he alone was acquainted with the counsels or designs of the Father, and from what follows " he hath declared him," this appears to be the true meaning of the place.

John ii. 19. " Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up, &c." See this explained, Dis. 5 page 76. 77.

John ii. 24. 25. " But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men, and needed not that any man should testify of man, for he knew what was in man." Our Lord Jesus Christ was made acquainted with the knowledge of the human heart, in consequence of the Wisdom and Spirit of the Father which dwelt in him. Math. xi. 27. " All things are delivered unto me of my Father." John iii. 34. " God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him." John xiv. 10. " The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself, &c." The Prophets and Apostles possessed the same knowledge on some occasions ; thus, Elisha knew what was in Gehazi's mind, 2 Kings v. 26. " Went not mine heart with thee ;" and Peter was acquainted with the deceitful intentions of Ananias and Sapphira, Acts v. It is not wonderful therefore, that our Lord should possess a knowledge of this kind.

John iii. 13. " And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven." This passage has been urged as a
proof

proof of the omnipresence of Christ, and that he was in heaven in his supposed divine nature, at the same time that he was upon earth. But that our Lord was not literally in heaven, at the time he spoke these words is evident, because he tells us that he came down from heaven. Now in whatever sense we take the words "came down from heaven," they clearly prove, that at that period he was not actually in heaven. Some Arians have been of opinion that the words *ho on en to ourano*, should be translated, "who was in heaven;" and it is certain, that *on* is so translated in Ch. ix. 25. of this Gospel, "*hoti taphlos on*, whereas I was blind, &c." But others taking the words as they stand in our version, find no difficulty in explaining them. The following is a most masterly illustration of this passage on Socinian principles, which I shall therefore give at full length. "This text (John iii. 13.) is by many supposed to be quite conclusive not only for the pre-existence of Christ, in that he is said to have come down from heaven; but as a proof of his deity, because an omnipresence peculiar only to God seems to be ascribed to him, viz. That whilst he was upon earth, he was at the same time also in heaven. And yet where persons have accustomed themselves to attend to the peculiar elevated language of holy scripture, how different do the same phrases appear? An eminent person at the dawn of the reformation no enemy to what is called the divinity of Christ, did nevertheless so clearly perceive that our Lord, by these lofty expressions, intended only to teach a very plain truth concerning himself, that he without scruple gave this interpretation of it to the public: "*Nul ne cognoit les choses celestes fors que moi, i. e. No one understands the things of God, but I only.*" † There are three things here asserted by our Lord. 1. That no one had ascended up to heaven but himself. 2. That he the son of man, had come down from heaven. 3. That himself was then in heaven, even while he was speaking to Nicodemus.

"A true

† Robert Stephens.

“ A true and consistent account of these positions will
 “ give us our Lord’s meaning in them.”

1. “ This whole discourse with Nicodemus is in the
 “ prophetic style, highly figurative. In the strict literal
 “ sense, it was by no means true, that no one had ascend-
 “ ed up to heaven, but the Son of man; for Enoch,
 “ the seventh from Adam, in all probability; and Elijah
 “ the prophet, had certainly been translated from earth
 “ to heaven. Neither was it true in the direct sense of
 “ the words, that the son of man, as here asserted, had
 “ ascended up to heaven. We have no account in the
 “ scriptures from whence alone we can know aught
 “ concerning him, that he ever ascended to heaven but
 “ once, when he took his final leave of this earth and of
 “ his disciples. Some other sense of the words then is
 “ to be sought for in which it might be said that the son
 “ of man had ascended up to heaven. Now as in our
 “ way of apprehension, a man that would be acquainted
 “ with the secrets of the divine will, should go to hea-
 “ ven to converse with God; it hence comes that the
 “ phrase ascending to heaven easily signifies the being
 “ admitted to the knowledge of God’s counsels. So
 “ Moses tells the Jews, that God had so clearly revealed
 “ his will to them from heaven by him, that there was
 “ no need for them to go up thither to be acquainted
 “ with it; Deut. xxx. 12. “ It is not in heaven, that
 “ thou shouldest say; who shall go up for us to heaven,
 “ and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it?”
 “ And Pro. xxx. 4. “ Who hath ascended up into
 “ heaven, or descended” i. e. who hath been acquainted
 “ with the mind of God, with heavenly truth?

2. If ascending up to heaven is not to be taken liter-
 “ ally, neither is descending from heaven to be under-
 “ stood of a local descent. For the son of man, as it is
 “ here also asserted, could not come down from heaven,
 “ where he had confessedly never been. What then is
 “ the usual scriptural meaning of the phrase coming down
 “ from heaven? Now Math. xxi. 25. Our Lord him-
 “ self explains it, in his question to the Jews; “the bap-
 “ tism

.. tism of John, was it from heaven, or of men? i. e.
 .. of divine or human institution or authority. John's
 .. baptism, therefore was from heaven, because it was of
 .. divine appointment: and John Baptist himself came
 .. from heaven, because he had a divine authority or com-
 .. mission. So James i. 17 " Every good gift and
 .. every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down
 .. (katabainon) from the Father of lights. iii. 15. 17.
 .. " This wisdom descendeth not from above,——but
 .. the wisdom that is from above is first pure &c — John
 .. iii. 31. " He that cometh from above is above all ;
 .. he that is of the earth, is earthly, and speaketh of the
 .. earth : he that cometh from heaven is above all. John
 .. Baptist in this last citation speaks modestly and dis-
 .. paragingly of his own authority and commission from
 .. God, compared with that of Christ, which was indeed
 .. far more illustrious and divine. " John vi. 33. " The
 .. bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven
 .. and giveth life unto the world." Ver. 51. " I am
 .. the living bread, which came down from heaven.
 .. Our Lord had before (Ver. 27) compared his doct-
 .. rine to meat, which would nourish men in virtue,
 .. and bestow an immortal life upon them. He here
 .. calls himself that meat, the bread that came down
 .. from heaven, because he had a divine authority to
 .. teach men the gospel of virtue, holiness, and eternal
 .. life."

" 3. (" The son of man, who is in heaven.") The
 .. Son of man, who had never been in heaven, could
 .. not (properly speaking) be there. Dr. Clark, and
 .. others very judiciously refer to John i. 18. as a parallel
 .. passage ; and understand " being in heaven" to be the
 .. same as " being in the bosom of the Father," i. e.
 .. highly favoured by God ; made acquainted with his
 .. benevolent counsels and designs. Grotius remarks
 .. here, that if the conversation of true christians (Phil.
 .. iii. 20 is said, whilst on earth, to be in heaven, with
 .. God : much more may this be said of Christ, who had
 .. continual extraordinary communications of wisdom
 .. : and

“ and power from God. These words of Christ therefore do not relate to any prior state of existence before he was born of Mary, or to any supposed divine nature annexed to his human nature: but what he declares to Nicodemus, stripped of that metaphorical dress in which he thought proper to clothe it, is; that himself alone was admitted to the knowledge of the whole will of God, and authorized to reveal it to men.” †

John v. 17 “ My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.” For an explanation of this and the following verses turn to Diff. v. p. 58. 59. 60.

John v. 23. “ That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father ” Those who peruse the Scriptures without consideration and reflection, or without attending to their scope and connection, are apt to imagine from this passage that the Son is to be honoured, with the same degree of honour that is due to the Father. But the Greek particle ΚΑΘΟΣ rendered AS or EVEN AS, by no means denotes an exact equality, but only a resemblance; as will appear from the following places. Eph. iv. 32. “ Be ye kind———forgiving one another (kathos) EVEN AS God in or by Christ hath forgiven you. Ch. vi. 5. Servants be obedient to them that are your masters———(kathos) AS unto Christ. 1 John ii. 6. “ He that saith he abideth in him, ought himself also to walk, (kathos) EVEN AS he walked. Now the kindness and compassion of Christians to one another, is far inferior to the mercy and benevolence of Almighty God in the forgiveness of sin; nor is the obedience that servants owe to their masters, so extensive and unlimited, as that which is due to Christ; and the piety and virtue of the most exemplary persons falls exceedingly short, of the sinless perfections of our Lord’s obedience. If then the particle AS does not signify equality in these instances why should it be thought to do so in the former case. Our Lord also says, Math. 5. 48. “ Be ye therefore perfect, (Gr. holper)

EVEN

† Mr. Lindsey’s Sequel to his Apology p. 213 to 219.

EVEN AS your Father which is in heaven is perfect;" but no body ever imagined from this, that christians were to aspire to the perfection of the Deity. Further, if we attend, to what our Lord says, before and after, we shall find, that the honour and respect which belongs to him, is very different from that which is due to the Father. Ver. 24, 23. "For the Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgement unto the Son.——He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father which hath sent him." The Son is to be honoured as a judge of the Father's appointment, and as his embassader; a species of honour essentially different from that, which is the unalienable prerogative of the Supreme Being.

John vi. 44. "No man can come to me, except the Father, which hath sent me, draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day." Christ will not raise the dead, by any power naturally residing in himself; but by the power of the Father communicated to him. For he tells us John v. 26. "For as the Father hath life in himself: so hath he given to the Son to have life (or the power of raising the dead) in himself: and in this same chapter, Ver. 39, our Lord observes "this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing; but should raise it up again at the last day." When Jesus raised Lazarus from the dead, we find him addressing the Father in this manner, John xi. 41, 42. "And Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. And I know that thou hearest me always: but because of the people which stand by, I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me." Again the very resurrection of our Lord himself, was effected by the Father's power. See Dis. v. p. 75 &c. No argument therefore can be formed for the Divinity of Christ, from his raising the dead at the general Judgement, since it is solely by a derived power that he will be enabled to perform it.

John viii. 58. "Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say

I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am." This passage has been much insisted on by Trinitarians, as a proof of the Deity of Christ: and it has been urged that our Lord here applies to himself, the very words that Almighty God makes use of to denote his self-existent and independent nature: in Exod. iii. 14, "And God said unto Moses, I am that I am: and he said, thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel. I am hath sent me unto you." It has been inferred therefore from this supposed application, that Jesus Christ possesses a divine nature, equally supreme and self-existent with that of the Father. But this notion is contradicted by the whole tenor of sacred scripture, in which our Saviour is declared to be a being produced by the power and will of the Father; and in all respects subservient to and dependent upon him. A great critic has shown, that the words in Exodus translated in our version "I am that I am," and rendered by the Septuagint in the same manner; do in the original Hebrew signify, *Ero qui ero* "I will be that I will be, that is, that God would perform whatever he had promised; which translation plainly proves, that there is not the smallest connection betwixt this passage and the words of Christ recorded by St. John: and so all the arguments founded upon this imagined allusion fall to the ground †

But

† Exod. iii. 14. "*Ero qui ero*," *ehjeh ascher ehjeh*.
 "Hic, ut multi putarunt, non edit nomen suum Deus, sed
 "Mosis questionem obiter cessat. Nam in sequentibus
 "manifesto Jehovah sese vocat; neque usquam alibi legi-
 "tur vox Ehjeh, quasi Dei nomen. Hoc igitur velle vide-
 "tur: non est quod nomen meum queras quod nullum
 "mihi hactenus tribui, is Ero Israel Deus, qui Ero,
 "quocunque me nomine appellitent parinde est; seu, eo
 "nomine appellari me patiar, quo appellabor. Ea est vis
 "repetitionis ejusdem verbi, cujus vide exempla ad Gen.
 "Chap. xliii. 13. Lxx. Int. verterunt, ego cimi ho on,
 "ego sum qui sum, qui egregius quidem est sensus,
 "sed ex Platonismo ut videtur, deducendus potiusquam
 "ex loci serie. Vide Eusebii Præpar. Evang. Lib. ix.
 "Cap. 9." Le Clerc in loco. In confirmation of

But further the words of our Lord himself, in John viii. 58. do not appear to have been rightly understood by our translators. For in all other places where the words I am, (Gr. Ego eimi) occur in this manner, they have uniformly supplied the sense by adding HE: but have omitted it in this place, being probably misled by the Septuagint and Vulgate. Thus in the 24. and 28. Verses of this chapter, we find HE very properly inserted, "I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins: for if ye believe not that (Ego eimi) I am he (i. e. I am the Christ) ye shall die in your sins." Then said Jesus unto them, when ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that (Ego eimi) I am HE, and that I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things. In this last citation, Jesus at the very time he makes use of the words I AM, declares that he can do nothing of himself, but was taught and instructed by his Father what to say. It is palpably evident from our Lords expressing himself in this manner, that no deep mysterious sense, implying divinity, is couched under the words I AM; but that they are only a concise declaration of the Messiahship of Jesus. In John xiii. 19. we have another instance of the same kind; "Now I tell you before it come, that when it is come to pass, ye may believe that (Ego eimi) I am HE." But the most striking instance of this way of speaking, is to be found in our Lords dialogue with the woman of Samaria. John iv. 25. 26. "The woman saith unto him, I know that Messias cometh, which is called Christ: when he is come, he will tell us all things. Jesus saith unto her I that speak unto thee am HE. (Gr. Ego Eimi.) Now the woman's observation, and our Lord's reply, prove beyond the possibility of a doubt, that Jesus intended nothing
confirmation of this interpretation of La Clerc's, it may be here observed, that the Chaldaee paraphrast Onkelos, renders this place of Exodus in the same manner. Et dixit Deus ad Moysen, Ero qui ero: i, e. And God said to Moses, I will be that I will be. Walton's Polyglot Bible.

thing else by this abrupt way of speaking : but to signify that he was the Christ : and from this passage it is also perfectly clear, that our translators have done well, in inserting HE in other places. And if they had not been misled by erroneous ideas, they would have rendered, John viii 58 in the same manner, viz. "Before Abraham was I am HE," that is, I am the Christ. But it may be here asked, how Christ could say, that he was before Abraham, if he only began to exist when he was born of Mary ? To this we reply that Christ's existing before Abraham, yea before the world was, is no proof at all of divinity ; and is no more than what the Arians have always maintained, who yet positively reject the Trinitarian system. But our Lord does not here say, that he was before Abraham, he only says, that before Abraham was I am he, or the Christ. He also observes, in Ver. 40 of this chapter. "But now ye seek to kill me a MAN that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God ; this did not Abraham." And in Ver. 56. he adds. "Your Father Abraham rejoiced to see my day ; and he saw it, and was glad." Now to see the day of a person beforehand, implies in the judgement of some, that the person himself did not then actually exist ; but was only at some future period to exist. Our Lord then may have only intended to intimate, that he was the Messiah promised to Mankind after the fall ; and foretold long before Abraham had a being ; and also the object of Abraham's Faith and joyful expectation. But whither Christ pre-existed or not, does not form a part of our present controversy with the Trinitarians. For the object of dispute is not the pre-existence, but the Divinity of Christ, and his equality with the God and Father of all ; which they affirm, and we think we have the best and most unexceptionable reasons in the world to deny.

John x. Ver. 30. "I and my Father are one." The Trinitarians taking this sentence by itself, without considering its connection with the preceding and following parts of our Lord's discourse, infer from it that the Father and the Son are one essence or substance, and consequently

frequently one God.. But our Lord himself does not say, that his Father and himself are one God, or one essence; but simply that they are (Gr. *hen*) one. And in what sense they are one, must be determined not arbitrarily; but according to the scope and meaning of the context; and the usage of the same mode of speech in other parts of Scripture. That the Father and the Son are not one essence, or substance, is evident from the dictates of common sense. For every person or intelligent agent, must have a distinct and separate essence of his own, or else he could not possibly exist at all. If the essence of the Son, is the same individual numerical essence with that of the Father; the distinct personality of each will be destroyed; and either the one or the other must cease to be a person. The Son will be the Father, and the Father the Son, and they will not only be one essence, but one person also, in the strictest sense. Thus, this pretended Unity of the Son with the Father, will be found to annihilate the Son altogether. If it is affirmed on the other hand, that the Father and the Son have distinct divine essences; and that they are only said to be one, because they are of a similar nature and substance; as the bodies of two men may be said to be of one substance: this is a plain breach of the Divine Unity, and an open acknowledgement of two Gods in number. Now the Trinitarians must either stand by the one or the other of these assertions, for there is no medium betwixt them; and the low stale device of mystery and incomprehensibility, may be urged in the defence of any given absurdity whatever. But if we will suffer the scripture to be its own interpreter, and attend to the manner in which our Lord introduces these words, we shall find an easy, obvious, and intelligible sense; in which it may be affirmed that he and the Father are one. Our Lord observes, Ver. 27. 28. 29. of this chapter. " My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me. And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand. My Father which gave them me, is greater than all; and none is able to pluck them out of

of my Father's hand." Christ had here asserted, that his sheep or followers, were in a state of security and safety, in consequence of their being under his protection, but lest any one should doubt of his ability for that purpose, he adds, that the Father who is greater than all, and consequently greater than himself, had given them unto him, and that the Father's power which was boundless, would be exerted in their behalf. And then he adds, "I and the Father are one;" the plain meaning of which is, I and the Father have the same benevolent designs and intentions, for the salvation of my people and followers; and the power of the Father is communicated to me and will be employed for that purpose. It is no argument in favour of our opponents, that the Jews understood our Saviour in an erroneous sense. For they were ever ready to lay hold of his words, and to put false and invidious constructions upon them. And we are not to argue from their false comments, but from the natural and apparent meaning of our Lord himself. It is not probable however, that the Jews understood our Lord in the sense that Trinitarians do now, as claiming to be a divine person equal with the Father; but only as assuming the power and authority of God. But our Lord fully explained himself to them, and declared, that he called himself the Son of God, only because the Father had sanctified him and sent him into the world; and justified himself for assuming this title by the scriptures, in which those are called Gods to whom the word of God came, or who had received power and authority from God, such as Kings, Judges, &c. This was a complete renunciation of proper divinity by our Lord, at a time when it was incumbent upon him to have declared the contrary, if he had really been in possession of it. And that the words of our Lord, "I and the Father are one," do not signify any unity of Essence, may be further proved, from the use of the same mode of speech in other places of scripture. John, xvii, 20. 21. "Neither pray I for these alone; but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be (Gr. *hen*) one; as thou, Father,

are in me, and I in thee, that they also may be (hen) ONE in us, &c." 1 Cor. iii. 8. "Now he that planteth (Paul) and he that watereth (Apollos) are (hen) ONE. Eph. ii. 14. "For he is our peace, who hath made both (Jews and Gentiles) (hen). ONE. Now in what sense, were our Lord's disciples, Paul and Apollos, the Jews and Gentiles, to be (hen) one thing? Were they one in essence or substance? The idea is too extravagant to be admitted, by any person of sound understanding: Undoubtedly they were one, only in respect of harmony, mutual benevolence, love, and a joint exertion of all their powers in the common defence of the Gospel. And if different persons, and even bodies of men, are said to be ONE in this sense, why may not our Lord and his heavenly Father although very unequal in nature and dignity, be allowed to be so also? It is unaccountably strange in many Trinitarians, to take the words of our Lord in a scholastic, false, and impossible sense, when the scriptures themselves point out an easy, natural way of interpreting them. And some Trinitarians have been sensible of the force of this, and have acknowledged it. In particular Calvin rejects this passage, as a proof of the unity of essence of the Son with the Father, and blames the Fathers for insisting upon it.

John, xii. 41. "These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and spake of him." This place was considered. Discourse, viii. Page, 137. 138. 139.

John, xiv. 1. "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me." It is strange, that these words should have been ever used as an objection. Christ is here plainly distinguished from God, and the Apostles are supposed by our Lord, to have believed in God previously to himself, which shows that the person of Christ, is not included under the word God. Believing in Christ does not imply Divinity in him, but only acknowledging him as the Messiah the Son of God, the great Messenger of the Father to Mankind, and the Saviour of the world. And our Lord tells us
John

John xii. 44. "He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me."

John xiv. 9. "Jesus saith unto him, have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, shew us the Father. believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me." Ver. 11. "Believe me, that I am in the Father, and the Father in me &c." The words he that hath seen me hath seen the Father," have been adduced as a proof, that the Son is a divine person equal with the Father. But if they were to be taken literally they would prove a very different doctrine, viz. that the Son was the Father himself. But the truth is, that our Lord intended nothing more by this way of speaking, but to intimate that he was the Father's representative, ambassador, and the great revealer of his will, that the wisdom and power of the Father resided in him, and were displayed to mankind by him. This passage is similar to the expression of St Paul, Col. i. 15. "Who (Christ) is the image of the invisible God. i. e. the person who above all others, resembles the Father most; or in whom his perfections most eminently appear. The Apostles also in conversing with Christ, had the best opportunity of knowing God, and of becoming acquainted with his will; and the way of obtaining his favour. The words, "believest thou not that I am in the Father and the Father in me," have been thought by Trinitarians, to refer to some kind of mysterious union or co-existence of two divine co-equal persons. But our Lord himself has explained them otherwise; for he tells us in the same verse, "the words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works. From which it appears, that he meant to inculcate an opposite doctrine; and to signify that the Father, or the Spirit of the Father, was the source of his wisdom and the author of all his miraculous works. See Dis. v. p. 61. 62.—We find similar language to this of our Lord used concerning pious and devout persons. 1 Cor. iii. 16. "Know

ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you." 2 Cor. vi. 16. As God hath said, "I will dwell in them and walk in them" 1 John iv. 16. "He that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him. When good christians are described in this manner, it is not surprising that Christ should talk of his being in the Father, and the Father in him.

John xiv. 14. "If ye shall ask any thing in my name I will do it." This appears to relate to the miraculous powers and extraordinary qualifications, that were conferred upon the first christians. Christ was enabled to bestow these gifts by the promise of the Holy Ghost which he received of the Father. It is observable that our Lord does not desire his Apostles, to ask from himself; but to ask in his name. And it is certain, that the person from whom they were to ask was the Father: for he tells them, John xvi. 23. "And in that day ye shall ask me nothing: Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you." This passage therefore, proves nothing more, but that Christ should grant the petitions of his disciples according to the will of the Father and to his glory; for he observes in the preceding verse, (John xiv. 13) "And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son."

John xvi. 15. "All things that the Father hath are mine." The ALL things here mentioned, appear to relate to the things of the christian church; because the Spirit is said to take of these things and give it unto the Apostles. It is said of christians. 1 Cor. iii. 21, "All things are yours;" therefore it is not wonderful that the same should be affirmed by our Lord Jesus Christ of himself. But whatever may be included under the word ALL, it is no proof of the divinity of Christ, for he tells us John iii. 35. "The Father loveth the Son and hath given all things into his hand." Whatever therefore Christ possesses, is the free and voluntary gift of the Father,

Father, and we are sure that God cannot receive from any person. See Rom. xi. 35 36.

John xvii. 5. "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine ownself, with the glory, which I had with thee before the world was." Christ's possessing glory with the Father before the world was, or occupying an eminent station in the heavenly world, can never be fairly urged as a proof of divinity: for it is not said that this glory was eternal, or that it was of the same nature with the glory of the Father. On the contrary, Christ clearly appears to have been divested of this glory, at the time he prayed for the restoration of it. But the Divine Being can never be deprived of the glories of his nature. With him there is no variableness neither shadow of turning. He cannot lay aside his essential perfections: far less can he pray to another to re-establish him in the possession of them. The language of our Lord here, is the language of a dependent being, looking up to another as the source of his felicity; and humbly imploring the Father to restore him to that elevated situation, that he once enjoyed in his presence. This place therefore, is so far from proving the divinity of Christ, that it evidently discovers to us, that he never possessed any proper divinity at all. I have hitherto been arguing on the supposition, that our Lord really possessed a glory with the Father prior to the creation of the world; which has ever been the opinion of all Unitarians of the Arian denomination. But there are many excellent and zealous advocates for the cause of truth; who think that the glory that our Lord here prays for, was a glory that he had not before been in possession of; but which was posterior to his sufferings and death. And it seems highly proper to produce their reasons for thinking so in this place. An Author who deserves the Good Will, Esteem, and Approbation, of all who bear the Unitarian name, explains this passage in the following manner. "It has been too hastily and erroneously concluded from this part of Christ's prayer, that he is asking Almighty God to bestow upon him something of which he had been in

“ in possession before the world was ; but which he had
 “ voluntarily relinquished, when he had his birth from
 “ his mother Mary. How little foundation there is for
 “ such a conclusion will appear by attending to the fol-
 “ lowing circumstances pointed out by our Lord him-
 “ self, in this very prayer, viz. 1. The date and com-
 “ mencement of that glory which he requests ; 2. His
 “ manner of speaking concerning the share which his
 “ disciples were to have with him in it ; 3. The nature
 “ of the glory itself. For. 1. He himself says, ver. 4. 5.
 “ “ I have finished the work which thou gavest me to
 “ do : and now, O Father, glorify thou me, &c. This
 “ shews that the glory he prayed for was to be subse-
 “ quent to the faithful discharge of his duty to God in
 “ this life, and the reward of it. He declares the same,
 “ Luke xxiv. 26. “ Ought not the Christ to have suf-
 “ fered these things, and to enter into his glory ? And
 “ so also 1 Peter. i. 10. 11. “ Of which salvation the
 “ prophets have enquired ;—searching what or what
 “ manner of time the spirit of Christ which was in them
 “ did signify, when it testified, beforehand the suffer-
 “ ings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. “ So
 “ that this glory was something hitherto unpossessed and
 “ future.”

“ 2. Ver. 22. He says—“ the glory which thou gavest
 “ (rather hast given) me, I have given them. Observe
 “ his words carefully. The glory that he speaks of,
 “ God, he says, had given to him. Not that it was al-
 “ ready bestowed upon him : for then there would have
 “ been no occasion to pray for it. But the heavenly
 “ Father had promised to bestow it ; and therefore he
 “ speaks of it as already given, because by the promise
 “ of God, which can never fail, it was as fully his own,
 “ as if he had been in actual possession of it. And in
 “ like sort, he had given this glory, he here saith to his
 “ disciples, i. e. promised it to them, (John xiv. 1. 2, 3.
 “ and at other times) had given it them by promise, and
 “ thereby insured it to them as much as if they were al-
 “ ready possessed of it. And therefore as our Lord says,
 that

“ that his Father had given him the glory he prays for,
 “ though it was not yet bestowed but only promised to
 “ him: so does he say, that “ he had glory with God
 “ before the world was:” not that he had really been
 “ in possession of it before the world was, but because it
 “ was destined for him by God, known unto whom are
 “ all his works from the beginning, Acts xv. 18. In the
 “ same manner, 2 Tim. i. 9. Eph. i. 4. God is said to
 “ have chosen us, and to have given us his grace, before
 “ the foundation of the world, before the world began:”
 “ although we had then assuredly no being. And Math.
 “ xxv. 34. where our Lord describes the blessing of those
 “ who shall have promoted his gospel, the cause of truth and
 “ righteousness:—he says “ Come ye blessed of my Fa-
 “ ther, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the be-
 “ ginning of the world.”—He might have said, inherit the
 “ kingdom which YOU HAVE HAD WITH GOD before
 “ the foundation of the world.” This interpretation
 “ receives farther confirmation by the petition which
 “ he offers up for his disciples, Ver. 24. viz. “ that
 “ they may behold my glory which thou hast given
 “ me; for thou lovedst me before the foundation of
 “ the world.” He here again speaks of the glory
 “ which God had intended to bestow upon him. And
 “ although it was before he had a being, he might say,
 “ that, “ God had loved him before the foundation of
 “ the world;” as God is said “ to have chosen and gi-
 “ ven us his grace before the world begun.” Some
 “ have conjectured, that the construction of this verse
 “ should be this,—“ that they may behold my glory
 “ which thou hast given me before the foundation of
 “ the world, because thou lovest me.” In which case
 “ the phrase will be entirely similar to ver. 5. and still
 “ farther illustrate it. But no stress is laid upon this,
 “ though there is not any thing forced in it. In ver. 23.
 “ preceding, he had said of his disciples; “ thou hast loved
 “ them, as thou hast loved me,” i. e. hast intended the
 “ same honour and glory for them as for me.

“ 3. What is the glory that Christ here requests the
 heavenly

.. heavenly Father to bestow upon him? We may as-
 .. sure ourselves, that as all prayer ever ought to be, so
 .. Christ's prayer now would be suited to his character,
 .. present circumstances, desires and expectations. What
 .. then so proper and natural for the holy and benevo-
 .. lent Jesus, at the close of life, to ask of the supreme
 .. Father, and sovereign disposer of all things, as the suc-
 .. cess of that Gospel, by which the virtue and happiness
 .. of mankind was to be promoted; which had been his
 .. sole aim and pursuit; for which he had lived, and for
 .. which he was about to die! To suppose him to pray
 .. for his own private happiness and advancement; and
 .. to animate himself with a prospect of that from God,
 .. as is the common opinion of the glory he sought, would
 .. not be suitable to that perfection of moral character
 .. which we cannot but ascribe to him, nor acting up to
 .. that idea of the most enlarged universal benevolence
 .. which seems to have actuated him. There is a very
 .. singular passage of his life recounted, John xii. 20.
 .. which happened only a day or two before he uttered
 .. this prayer, which wonderfully discovers to us what
 .. lay nearest his heart, and was the object of his wishes,
 .. the glory he sought. Some Greeks, or religious Gen-
 .. tiles had desired the favour of seeing him, in all pro-
 .. bability to know, whether they, who were not of the
 .. race of the Jews, might hope for any benefit from
 .. him the fame of whose virtues, miracles, and high
 .. favour with God had reached them. Upon his Apost-
 .. les' telling him of the curiosity and desire of these
 .. strangers he thus, with a kind of exultation, expres-
 .. ses the great satisfaction he had in it, Ver. 23. 24.
 .. "The hour is come that the son of man should be
 .. glorified. Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a
 .. corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it ab-
 .. deth alone: But if it die, it bringeth forth much
 .. fruit;" i. e. "Are these Gentiles desirous to
 .. see me! Now is the time near, when the salu-
 .. tary truths of the gospel shall be made known to
 .. them, and to all the world." [This is plainly what
 he

“ he means by his being glorified.] “ But it is by my
 “ death, which is approach ing, and the happy consequen-
 “ ses of it, that this most desirable event will be brought
 “ about.” † Upon this being affected. (for he could not
 “ have been a man, had he not been so) with the thought
 “ and near prospect of his sufferings and death; he says,
 “ Ver. 27. “ Now is my soul troubled: and what
 “ shall I say, Father, save me from this hour? But
 “ for this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify
 “ thy name.” i. e. “ Though nature shrinks upon the
 “ view of the evils that are before me, and would prompt
 “ me to seek a deliverance from them; I will not
 “ desire it. Heavenly Father, let thy truth flourish and
 “ prevail by my means! Whatever I am to suffer, I
 “ gladly submit.” Ver. 28. Then there came a voice
 “ from heaven, saying, I have both glorified it, and will
 “ glorify it again; i. e. “ I have already given thee a
 “ foretaste of thy glory, by the success which has attend-
 “ ed thy miracles and preaching. And I will honour
 “ thee still more, and add to thy glory, by raising thee
 “ speedily to life, and enlarging thy powers of promoting
 “ the Gospel of truth and righteousness.” Thus it ap-
 “ pears, that the great object of our Lord’s thoughts,
 “ upon the approach of death, what he most earnestly
 “ desired

† John vii. 39. “ The Holy Spirit was not yet giv-
 “ en because that Jesus was not yet glorified: i. e. his
 “ glory was to be promoted by sending the miraculous
 “ powers to the Apostles and his first followers, by
 “ which the success of the Gospel was to be promo-
 “ ted.”

John xiii. 31. 32. “ Now is the son of man glorified;
 “ and God is glorified by him. If God be glorified by
 “ him, God shall also glorify him in himself; and shall
 “ straightway glorify him.” Christ glorified God by his
 “ voluntary death in the cause of his truth: and Christ
 “ was glorified immediately, by the miracles done at
 “ his death, his resurrection in three days, and its con-
 “ sequence, the success of the gospel.”

“ desired, his expected glory was the success of the gospel that he preached.” † §

John xx. 28. “ And Thomas answered and said unto him; my Lord, and my God.” This was an abrupt exclamation, uttered by Thomas at a time, when his incredulity was removed, and he had received the most satisfactory evidence from our Lord himself, of the certainty of his resurrection, and the identity of his person. Thomas does not say to Christ, thou art my Lord, and my God, but simply exclaims in a transport of admiration “ my Lord! and my God!” which for ought we know to the contrary, may have been directed to the Father who raised Christ from the dead. In the same manner pious and devout persons, when any sudden, unexpected, and surprising event happens, will sometimes say, good Lord! or good God! An ancient Father who lived in the fourth century gives the following interpretation of Thomas’ words “ He did not call Christ, Lord and God: but “ being astonished at the great miracle of his resurrection, and the full evidence of it that he had afforded “ him, he praised God, who had raised Christ from the dead

† Mr Lindsey’s Sequel to his Apology p. 239 to 246.

§ Grotius and Le Clerc interpret John xvii. 5. in the same manner, viz; of the glory that was destined, prepared, or laid up for Christ, before the world was. See Grotius in loco, and Le Clerc’s *Harmonia Evangelica*. Augustin also understood this passage in the same way. “ Et nunc clarifica me tu Pater apud te metiptum, claritate, quam habui priusquam mundus esset, apud te: tamquam dicere, Claritatem quam habui apud te, id est, illam claritatem, quam habui apud te in predestinatione tua, jam tempus est, ut apud te habeam etiam vivens in dexterâ tua, i. e. “ And now glorify thou me Father with thy self, with the glory, which I had before the world was, with thee; as if he had said,” it is now time for me to be put in actual possession at thy right hand, of that glory which I had with thee, that is, had in thy predestination, or fore-appointment. Augustini Opera. tom 9. Tr. 105. p. 509. Ed. Frob. Basile 1569. Where, a good deal more to the same purpose may be found

“ dead.” † A learned modern writer following the same idea, observes as follows.—— My Lord, and my God;—the faith of St Thomas, was only this, that Jesus was really risen from the dead. For when the Apostles had told him, they had seen the Lord; he answers, “that except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and thrust my hands into his side I will not believe” (it.) Then Christ coming a second time faith unto him: “reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side, and be not faithless but believing” viz. that I am risen. Lastly, our Saviour saith, “Thomas, because thou hast seen me thou hast believed; which shews that he could believe only what he had seen, to wit, that the same body was raised, which had been crucified; neither had he seen, nor could he see with his bodily eyes, that he who was thus raised, was his Lord and his God. These words therefore, “my Lord, and my God,” may have this import; “my Lord and my God, hath done this: And so they exactly agree with the faith of the Apostles, saying, “the God of our Fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew, and hanged on a tree.” Acts v. 30. See Acts ii. 24. Acts. iii. 15. iv. 10. and xiii. 30. Or thus, “my Lord, and my God! How great is thy power; for, saith St Paul, “God exerted the greatness of his power, and the activity of his might, in raising our Lord Jesus from the dead.” Eph. i. 19. 20. But whither this be the true import of St Thomas’ words or no, certain it is, that it cannot be proved, that he did intend by them to signify that he owned Jesus Christ as his Lord and his God.

First. Because he was bred up in the Jewish Faith, which taught him that the Lord his God, the God of Israel, was one Lord, and that there was no other than he: And secondly, it would have contradicted the faith of Christ himself, who after his resurrection

† Theodore Bishop of Mopsuestia, as quoted by Dr. Lardner.

“ rection speaks to his disciples thus: “ I ascend to
 “ my Father and to your Father, and to my God and
 “ your God, John xx. 17. And again “ Him that over-
 “ cometh, will I make a pillar in the temple of my God,
 “ and he shall go no more out: and I will write upon
 “ him the name of my God, and the name of the city
 “ of my God, which is new Jerusalem, which cometh
 “ down out of heaven from my God: and I will write
 “ upon him my new name.” Rev. iii. 12. †

John xxi. 17. “ And he said unto him, (Peter said
 unto Jesus) Lord thou knowest all things; thou know-
 est that I love thee.” The word ALL in scripture, is
 not always to be taken in an universal sense; but is
 sometimes to be limited to the subject in hand. Thus
 St Paul tells the Coriathians, 1 Ep. iii. 21. “All
 things are yours,” and St John says of those to whom
 he wrote,” 1 Ep. Chap. ii. 20. “ But ye have an
 unction from the holy One, and ye know all things” That
 our Lord Jesus Christ did not literally know all things that
 were possible to be known, is evident, because he expres-
 sly declared, that he was ignorant of the day of Judge-
 ment. Math. xxiv. 36. Mark xiii. 32. Nor is the
 knowledge of Peter’s heart, or the hearts of others, any
 proof of divinity, because it was communicated to our
 Lord

† Dr. Whitby’s last thoughts, &c. p. 77. 78. Dr.
 Whitby was once a strict Trinitarian, and in his Com-
 mentary on the New Testament, and in other works, he
 strenuously supported that system. But when far advan-
 ced in life, he became convinced that the Athanasian doc-
 trine, of a co-equal and consubstantial Trinity was erro-
 neous. He possessed the integrity of mind to change
 his opinion, and the magnanimity to avow it openly;
 and became an advocate for that Faith which once he
 endeavoured to destroy. He confuted Bishop Bull’s,
Defensio Fidei Nicænæ, opposed Dr. Waterland and in
 his last thoughts on religion, has retracted and corrected
 several interpretations of scripture, in his own Commen-
 tary on the New Testament.

Lord by the Father : and the Prophets and Apostles on some occasions possessed the same knowledge. See p. 197. The words of Peter are therefore to be understood, only as declaring his opinion of the great extent of our Lord's knowledge. " Lord thou whose knowledge is very great and extensive, to whom the Spirit has been imparted without measure, and who hast on many occasions, even before thy death and resurrection, manifested an intimate acquaintance with, and accurate knowledge of the human heart, cannot be ignorant at present of the prevailing sentiments of my mind. Thou art conscious of the sincerity of my attachment, and the cordiality of my love ; so that there is no occasion for me to make an express declaration of it in words." This seems to be the full import of Peter's words, nor can any thing further be fairly inferred from them.

We have now fully considered and answered, the objections of our opponents occurring in the Evangelists ; and we shall therefore put a period to this discourse, which has been extended to a more than usual length. It will be the subject of the next, to reply to those objections, which are supposed to occur in the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of St Paul and others, and the Revelation of St John. May the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is blessed for evermore, be glorified in all things. AMEN.

DISCOURSES ON THE DIVINE UNITY.

DISCOURSE X.

Joha Chap. xvii. Ver. 3. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

HAVING in our seventh, eighth, and ninth discourses, replied to the objections of Unitarians, drawn from the Old Testament, and the Evangelists; we enter to day upon the consideration of the objected passages, in the other books of Scripture: viz in the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of St. Paul and others, and in the Apocalypse or Revelation of St. John. The first place which occurs to us in the order of the sacred Books, is the following.

Acts. vii, 59. "And they stoned Stephen, calling upon (God,) and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my Spirit." Admitting that the word God, were rightly understood here, it could not be proved from it, that Stephen called our Lord Jesus Christ, God. For as in the supernatural vision with which he was favoured, he saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing at his right hand, he might call upon or address God the Father, and commend his Spirit to the care of Jesus at the same time. But the word God, does not occur in the original Greek, and was put in Italics by our Translators on that account. Nor is there any necessity for inserting it, as the sense is very complete without it, and the passage may be rendered thus, "And they stoned Stephen invoking, and saying, Lord Jesus receive my Spirit." In this, or a similar manner, it is rendered in the

the Vulgate, and several oriental versions. § Our Lord's being described in the preceding verse, as standing at the right hand of God; and Stephen's addressing him on this occasion, is no argument for the divinity of Christ. For God being a spiritual being, has not properly speaking a right hand or a left: and to stand or sit at his right hand, only denotes, a state of high dignity and exaltation in heaven. Besides the very expression, "standing at the right hand of God," implies, that Jesus Christ is a distinct and separate being from God; and that he is not of the same essence or substance with him. And it was extremely natural, for the first excellent Martyr Stephen, to recommend his Spirit to the protection of his Lord and Master, whom he saw with his eyes in a state of heavenly glory. But it is observable that Stephen (Ver. 56) calls Jesus even in this state of exaltation, the SON OF MAN, a term very different from that of the most high God, and utterly inapplicable to the Supreme Being.

Acts xx. 28. "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. We have before shewn that the holy Spirit denotes, either the Divine Being, even the Father himself; or his power, influences, energy, and operations, and therefore shall add nothing more upon this subject. If the "church of God," were the true reading in this place, it would only prove, that Jesus Christ may be called God in the inferior sense; or that the blood of Christ may be called the blood of God, because it was the blood of his Son, whom God sent into the world, and permitted his blood to be shed for the benefit of Mankind. For the Supreme Being

§ Vulg. "And they stoned Stephen, invoking, and saying, Lord Jesus, &c." Syriac. "Therefore they stoned Stephen, whilst he prayed, and said, our Lord Jesus, &c." Arabic, "And they stoned Stephen, praying, and saying, O Lord Jesus, &c." Ethiopic "And Stephen exclaimed, saying, my Lord Jesus, &c." Walton's Polyglot Bible.

Being himself cannot be incarnate, and therefore has no blood to shed; he cannot die, for he is the author and source of life and happiness to the whole creation. And this would be a sufficient reply to our opponents, although the present reading could not be objected to. But there is great reason to call in question the genuineness of the present reading. It is only supported by a very few manuscripts, and these not the best nor the most ancient with the Vulgate, and one or two oriental versions. One Ms. reads the "church of the Lord God," another "the church of God and the Lord" and several "the church of the Lord and of God" and the most ancient Syriac Version "the church of Christ. But the Manuscripts of the greatest value and antiquity, read simply (ten ecclesian tou Kurion) the church of THE LORD, and a great many Fathers, and some versions, join in the same. So that this reading is the best supported of any, and is therefore in all probability the original words of St. Luke: and the passage will run thus "Feed the church of the Lord (Jesus) which he hath purchased with his own blood. †

Rom. ix. 5. "Whose are the Fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen. In our sixth discourse p. 88, we pointed out the true meaning of the expression *kata sarka*, "concerning the flesh, or according to the flesh," and shewed that it does not signify according to human nature, but according to carnal descent. The words "God over all," if applicable to Christ would only signify, that the Father had made him Lord and Christ, and constituted

† The Mss. that read simply "the church of the Lord" are the following viz. The Alexandrian, Ephrem, Cambridge, Basil, and five more. The Coptic and Armenian versions, the later Syriac in the margin, with the Apostolical constitutions, also follow the same: as do, Irenæus, Didymus, Eusebius, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Ammonius, Jerom, Augustin, and several other ancient writers. See Wettstein and Griesbach in loco. Where a Treasure of Criticism on this passage may be found.

constituted him a God, or ruler over all. For all the power and authority of Christ, is derived from, and dependent upon, the God and Father of all, who hath highly exalted him, and given him a name that is above every name, Phil. ii 9 &c. But the Greek words (ho on epi panton Theos eulogetos eis tous aionas, Amen.) are of ambiguous construction, and may be rendered either as our Translators have done; or by putting a full stop after the words Christ came, may run thus, "God who is over all, be blessed for ever. Amen!" or thus, who (Christ) is over all, God be blessed for ever. Amen. In this last method Mr. Locke has paraphrased them. If either of these two last translations are adopted, it will be the Father and not Christ, that is here styled, "God over all." And in favour of these, the use of the word EULOGETOS, blessed, in scripture, may be alledged. Mark xiv. 61. "Art thou the Christ the Son of the blessed?" 2 Cor. xi. 31. "The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is blessed for evermore, &c." See also Rom. i. 25. 2 Cor. i. 3. Eph. i. 3. 1 Pet. i. 3. In all which places the epithet blessed is either appropriated to, or must be understood of, the Father. The Amen too which the Apostle adds, applies better to a Doxology than a Narrative. It appears that this place, was read in this or a similar manner, in the first ages of the church, from the language of several ancient writers. To call Christ, "the God over all," is declared in the Apostolical constitutions, and Epistles of Ignatius, to be heretical. Origen says it is rashness to do so as being inconsistent with Christ's own words, "My Father is greater than I." And Eusebius, through all his books against Marcellus, lays it down as the constant known doctrine of the church, that Christ himself is not, (ho epi panton Theos, and ho spekeina ton holon Theos,) the God over all; but that these are the peculiar titles of the Father. And he particularly affirms, that whosoever applies these titles to Christ, cannot be a pious person.† The testimonies of these ancient

† Dr. Clark's works, Vol. 4. p. 46. Lond. 1738.

ancient writers, must be allowed to be of considerable weight; and they shew that in their time the words, "God over all," were not applied to Christ; and also that a great and remarkable distinction was made betwixt him and the Father. †

Rom. x. 12. "For the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him." The Lord over all here mentioned, appears to be the Father, who in the 9 verse is said to have raised the Lord Jesus from the dead; but Christ undoubtedly is under God and by his appointment Lord over all; for we are told Rom. xiv. 9. "To this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living."

Rom. xiv. 10. 11. "We shall all stand before the judgement seat of Christ. For it is written as I live saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God." See this place explained, Diss. viii. p. 146. 147.

1 Cor. i. 2. "With all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours." To call upon the name of Christ, or address him by prayer, although we were to understand these words in this sense, would afford no proof of the divinity of Christ, or his equality with the Father. For God may reveal to Christ in heaven, the wants and necessities of Christians here below, in the same manner as he communicated to him the knowledge of the human heart, while he lived on earth. But there is no necessity for understanding the words, in this manner. For as a learned

† Schlingius, and after him Dr. Whitby, Dr. Taylor, and others, have conjectured, that a transposition might have happened in the Apostle's words, and that he originally wrote, on ho, instead of, ho on epi panton Theos, in which case the sense of the passage would be this; "Whose are the Fathers; of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came; whose is the God over all blessed for ever. Amen. This conjecture is extremely ingenious, and would make a very noble sense. But it is not supported by the authority of any Mss.

ed writer observes, " to call on the name of Christ, is a phrase used in a great variety of senses, and with other synonymous expressions, sometimes signifies, 1. believing on him, acknowledging him as our Saviour, openly professing ourselves Christians, or being baptized in his name; 2. invoking his name upon diseased persons, in order to a miraculous cure; some times 3. praying in his name, or through his intercession; some times 4 directly calling upon, or invoking him ——— Acts vii. 59." † This last sense relates to Stephen, the only instance alledged, wherein calling upon Christ signifies directly invoking him. And as his case was peculiar, being favoured with a vision of our Lord, it cannot apply to other persons unless they were placed in the like circumstances. Another learned writer, has the following comment upon this place. " Call upon the name of Jesus Christ." Epicalleisthai signifies to be firnamed, Math. x. 3. Luke xxii. 3. Acts i. 23. and iv. 36. and in many other places, and so in a passive not active signification. Agreeable to this, epicalleisthai onoma Jesou Christou, is, " to be called by the name of Jesus Christ," as an agnomen or supernomination, which notes the special relation we have to him; as the spouse of that husband whose name is, " called upon her," Isa. iv. 1. (which is the direct literal notion of epicalleisthai here) or as the servant to that master, by whose name he is called also; and so epicaloumenoi onoma Christou, is but a periphrasis of Christians, and no more. §

1 Cor. x. 9. " Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of Serpents." Explained, Dis. viii. p. 130. 131.

2 Cor. viii. 9. " For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich. This place is very improperly urged by the Trinitarians, as a proof of their doctrine. For if Jesus Christ had

† Dr. Clarks works Vol. 4. p. 73 74.

§ Dr. Hammond in loco.

had been God, he must have always continued rich, and could never have become poor, as the Apostle affirms he did. The Deity is immense and eternal, and can never abase himself, or diminish himself, in any degree. He cannot lay aside the glories and perfections of his nature, and become a frail mortal man. Nor can any Union be formed betwixt him and a man, so as that the actions, or sufferings of that man, can be properly ascribed to him. But although God cannot change or be diminished, yet the most perfect creature may. It is therefore the Unitarians only who hold Christ to be a Creature or dependent Being, that can account for his becoming poor, or that can give any consistent interpretation of the words of the Apostle in this place.

2 Cor. xiii. 14. "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen." This passage is no objection, but rather an argument in favour of Unitarianism. The Father only is characterised here by the word God, and Jesus Christ is plainly distinguished from him. There are several instances of God and the creature being mentioned together, in scripture: and our Lord Jesus Christ as the head of the christian church, and the medium of the divine communications with Mankind is very properly joined with him in this as well as other apostolical Benedictions. See Dis. ii. p. 21. 22. and Dis. ix. p. 163. 164. The Communion of the Holy Ghost in this place denotes, the participation and enjoyment of spiritual gifts and Qualifications.

Eph. iii. 9. "And to make all men see, what is the fellowship (or rather oeconomy) of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ." "The words Jesus Christ, (Gr. dia Jesou Christou) have been rejected by some able critics as an interpolation, because they are wanting in some of the most ancient and valuable Manuscripts, in several ancient versions, and in the writings of many Fathers, who quote the rest of the verse without them.

them. † Although they were genuine, and considered as respecting the original creation and formation of all things, they would not prove that Jesus Christ was God, but only that he was the instrument by whom God created all things.

Eph. iv. 8. "Wherefore he saith, when he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men." Considered and explained, *Dis. viii. p. 129, 130.*

Phil. ii. 6. to 11. "Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a Servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth: and that every tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father." This passage has been the subject of many critical disquisitions and inquiries; and as the first part of it stands in our translation, might tend greatly to mislead a mere English reader. A person unacquainted with the original, when he reads "Jesus Christ being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God," might be very naturally led to conclude, (as many Trinitarians have erroneously done,) that Jesus was really a divine person equal with the Father. But if he allows himself time for recollection, and goes on to

† The words (*dia Jesou Christou*) by Jesus Christ, are wanting in the Alexandrian, Ephrem, and Cambridge Manuscripts, in those called Boreellii, and Wolfii, and in two others. They are also wanting, in the Vulgate, Syriac, Coptic, and Ethiopic versions; and in the Fathers Tertullian, Jerom, Ambrose, Pelagius, the dialogue against Marcion, Basil, Cyril, and Theodoret. Dr. Mill, and Bengelius set them aside also. See Wetstein in loco, and Walton's Polyglot Bible. Dr. Harwood has omitted them in his late edition of the Greek Testament, Lond. 1776.

to peruse the whole passage deliberately as it is here quoted, taking it in its just connection, he will find this conclusion to be erroneous, and be apt to suspect even without the assistance of criticism, that the words "thought it not robbery to be equal with God," are not rightly rendered in our version. For the being that is here said to have been in the form of God, is afterwards declared to have been in the form of a servant, and in the likeness of men, and to have humbled himself, and become obedient unto death even the death of the cross. Now a person who has any just conceptions of the divine nature at all, may be easily satisfied, that such an amazing change could never take place upon God. Could that Being who is eternal and omnipotent, who filleth heaven and earth with his presence, in whom we all live, move, and have our being, with whom there is no variableness neither shadow of turning, ever be divested of the essential perfections of his nature, and appear in the form, of a frail, impotent, mortal man; subject to pain, misery, and death? Every ingenuous well informed mind must revolt at the thought, and see at once that it is impossible. That the God of nature should be abased, degraded, and crucified, are ideas too gross and shocking to be admitted and believed by any person that will permit his rational faculties to operate, and not tamely resign his understanding into the hands of others. But further, the person who is here said to be in the form of God, and to have abased and humbled himself, is afterwards declared by the Apostle to have been exalted, and to have had a name given or conferred upon him that is above every name, &c. Now this exaltation or advancement, is as incompatible with the character of the Supreme Being, as the depression or humiliation mentioned before. And if Jesus Christ had been God, or equal with God, he could not have been promoted or exalted. Being already possessed of Deity, he would have possessed every thing in consequence of it, and could never have received an accession to his natural inherent dignity, dominion, and glory, from any being whatever, far less could he have been declared to be Lord to the glory of God the Father.

These are reflections, that I apprehend would naturally occur to a sensible person, divested of all prejudice, and attachment to a system, from an attentive perusal of this passage, even as it stands in our version. I know the Trinitarians have a salvo here, and betaking themselves to the pretended distinction of natures in Christ tell us, that it was only his human nature that was exalted. But there is no room for this subterfuge here more than in other places. St. Paul expressly affirms, that it was the same being that was in the form of God, that humbled himself, and afterwards was exalted on that account. He speaks of a being that voluntarily abased himself, and afterwards received a great and glorious reward. But the human nature of Christ (according to the system of our opponents,) not being in the form of God, but being a considerable part of the act of abasement itself, could not be rewarded for what it never performed, Nor could the glorifying and exalting a human nature be any reward to a Divine being. This interpretation of the Trinitarians is therefore quite foreign to, and inconsistent with the ideas and reasoning of the Apostle. We come now to give the true explication of the words "being in the form of God." As Jesus Christ is here plainly distinguished from God by the Apostle, it is perfectly clear that the words (*MORPHE THEOU*) form of God, are not to be taken in an abstract, philosophical, or metaphysical sense, but in the plain popular sense, in which the word *FORM* occurs in Scripture. Mark xvi. 12. "After that he appeared in another *FORM*, (*Gr*, *Morphe*) unto two of them, as they walked and went into the country," See also the compounds of the same word used, Math. xvii. 2. Mark ix. 2. Rom viii. 29. Phil. iii. 21. In which places the word *morphe*, (*form*) and its derivatives, does not signify the nature, or essence of a person or thing, but its figure, resemblance, and appearance. Taking the words therefore in this truly scriptural sense, "the form of God," does not denote that Jesus Christ was God, but that he bore the appearance or resemblance of God. The expression "thought it not robbery

bery

bery to be equal with God" is entirely an erroneous translation, by no means warranted by the original Greek. Many learned critics have shewn, that the true meaning of the phrase [*ouch harpagmon hegēsato to einai isa, Theo.*] is, did not eagerly covet, or aspire, to be like God; or did not look on it as a prize to be hastily caught at to be like God; or was not eager to retain that likeness to God. § And the words that follow confirm this interpretation. "But made himself of no reputation." [*Gr. ali' heauton ekenōse*] "But emptied himself." If Jesus Christ had been equal with God, or possessed of a nature properly divine, he could not have emptied himself: but the likeness or resemblance of God might be laid aside, and there is no absurdity in supposing it to be so. This being the true explication of the passage, no argument can be raised from it for the divinity of Christ, or his equality with the Father. It would have been very surprising indeed if St Paul had ventured to contradict (as our English version makes him do,) his Lord and Master who tells us, John xiv. 28. "My Father is greater than I." And St Paul himself also assures us, Eph. iv. 6. that "there is one God and Father of

§ See Grotius, Le Clerc, Weistein, Lamb. Bos, Dr. Whitby, Mr Pierce of Exeter, and Dr. Clark in loco. Abp. Tillotson, and Bp. Bull, also disapprove of the common Translation. It appears from the testimonies of Origen, Novatian, and the churches of Vienna and Lyons, and other ancient writers, that this passage was understood by them very differently from the manner in which our Translators have rendered it, and that they by no means inferred the equality of Christ with God from it. The Greek word *ισα*, is here used adverbially, and signifies, as, or like, not denoting equality, but only a likeness or resemblance. It occurs frequently in the Septuagint in this sense. Job. iv. 15. "They grope in the noon-day [*isa nukti*] as in the night. Job x. 10. "Hast thou not curdled me [*isa turo*] as cheese." Job xi. 12, "Man is born [*isa ono eremite*] like a wild ass's colt, and in various other places in the same version,

of all, who is above all, through all, and in you all," which words are absolutely inconsistent with the equality of Jesus Christ, or any other Being with the Father, and may satisfy any person, that such an idea never entered into the Apostles mind, or was ever by him committed to writing. We shall now briefly give the interpretations, that the Unitarians both of the Arian and Socinian denomination, put upon this passage. The Arians consider the form or resemblance of God here mentioned, and the likeness to God that our Lord was not eager to retain, as respecting a state of pre-existent glory and dignity, which he enjoyed with the Father prior to his coming in the flesh; which glory according to them, our Lord voluntarily resigned or emptied himself of, upon his incarnation. Our Lord is here affirmed say they, to have been in the form of God, and to be like God, because he was the first, the most illustrious and dignified, of all the creation; the image and representative of his God and Father. This glory he freely and generously resigned, for the good of Mankind; assumed a human body, and appeared in the world in the form of a servant and the fashion of a man, and humbled himself yet farther, by submitting to the painful and ignominious death of the cross. On account of this disinterested benevolence, and amazing condescension, God (hyperbolic) exalted him higher than before, (as the Greek word signifies) and was pleased to add to his original dignity, by subjecting the whole celestial and terrestrial world to his dominion, and to confer upon him the title of Lord, or Ruler over all, which office he holds, and title he bears, as the free gift and to the glory of God the Father. The Socinians (who do not admit the pre-existence of Christ,) are of opinion, that the form of God, and likeness to God, mentioned by St. Paul, respects the person and character of Jesus Christ on earth, and consisted in those great and wonderful powers with which he was endowed, viz. the fulness of the Father, or the communication of the Spirit without measure, which resided in him and was the source of his divine wisdom and knowledge.

and

and the cause of those miraculous works; by the performance of which he appeared more like a God than a man. That he is said to empty himself of these high powers, because he did not exercise them for his own emolument, or make any ostentatious display of them, in order to procure praise, esteem, or authority to himself; but only exercised them for the glory of God, and the benefit of mankind. "And took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men." The Socinians observe, that these words are more properly rendered from the Greek, "taking upon him the form of a servant or slave, and was (or being) in the likeness of men;" and denote the lowness of his condition in this world; Math. viii. 20. "The son of man hath not where to lay his head;" Math. xx. 28. "The son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister. Our Lord Jesus Christ acted the part of a servant here below, ministering to the wants and necessities of others, assuming nothing to himself, but conducting himself with the greatest humility and condescension, in all respects. So that these words they think, are not intended to signify what God made Christ, but how Christ acted and behaved during his residence on earth. "And being found in fashion as a man," or (as heuretheis may be rendered) "and being in the fashion of a man," that is, being in the situation and circumstances of other men. "He humbled himself and became obedient unto death, &c." i. e. He made no use of his extraordinary miraculous powers and qualifications, to hinder or retard his sufferings and death, and to prevent the malice of his enemies from taking effect, but on this occasion as well as others emptied himself of these powers, appearing as if were divested of them, and calmly submitted to the cruel and painful death of the cross. "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, &c." On account of the humility of Jesus, and his eminent labours and sufferings for the glory of God, and the good of mankind, God hath been pleased to advance him to a state of the highest dignity.

nity in heaven, and to confer upon him a sovereign power, authority, and dominion, &c.' †

Col i. 15. "Who (Christ) is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature. For by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist. And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the first born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence. For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell." This passage although interpreted in the strictest and most literal manner, will prove nothing more, but what both ancient and modern Arians have maintained, viz. That Jesus Christ existed with the Father in a state of glory before the creation, and was employed by him as an instrument, or a subordinate operator, in the formation and creation of all things. For it is not said, that Jesus Christ created all things by his own power and agency, but that (*Gr. en auto*) in him, all things were created, which (being synonymous to *di' autou*, through him, used afterwards) denotes not the first, or efficient cause, but the second, or ministering cause. See *Dis. ix. p. 182. 183.* It is also added, that, "all things were created—for him, and he is before all things and by him all things consist:" the plain meaning of which is, (if a proper creation is here intended) that all things were created with respect to Christ, and in the sequel to be subjected to him, as they actually were at his resurrection from the dead; that he existed before any other created being; and that he is employed by God,

28

† The above is a brief representation of the Socinian explication of Phil. ii. 6 &c. But to those who would wish to see this method of interpretation unfolded more at large, I would recommend a perusal of Mr. Lindsey's *Sequel to his Apology*, from p. 272 to 278, and the *Theological Repository*, Vol 2, from p. 141. to 154, and 219, to 230.

as an instrument in the preservation and government of the world. That Jesus Christ is not God, may be proved from this very passage by four decisive arguments. 1. He is here styled the image of the invisible God. Now the image of the invisible God, must be a different being from that invisible God whose image he is: for no being can be the image of itself. See Dis. v. p. 68. 2. He is styled, "the first born of every creature," which clearly proves that he is not eternal, but that he was produced or brought into being, at some period or other; and to explain these words otherwise, as some have done, is only doing unnatural violence to an obvious expression. See Dis. v. p. 68. 69. 3. He is called the first born from the dead, which implies, that however great and excellent he was he actually died: Now if there be any truth that is clear or certain, it is this, that God who is the life and soul of the creation, cannot die. As sure therefore as our Lord Jesus Christ died, and was raised from the dead by the Father, so sure is it, that he is not the most high God. 4. It is added, "for it pleased the Father that in him all fulness should dwell," or as some render it, "by him to inhabit all fulness." The word Father is not in the Greek but it is necessary to understand it; and therefore our Translators have done very well to supply it. If therefore the Father's fulness dwelt in Christ, or the Father inhabited by him all fulness, it clearly follows, that all the power and excellence that Christ possesses, or ever possessed, was solely derived from the good pleasure of the Father; and that if he acted a subordinate part in the original creation, he only exercised the Father's power, and not any inherent or independent power of his own. But several learned persons, and able scriptural critics, besides the professed Socinians, have been of opinion, that this whole passage respects the new creation, or moral renovation of the world by Jesus Christ. In particular Grotius observes upon this place, "It is certain that all things were created by the Word.

But

E c

“ But what goes before shews, that the Discourse here
 “ turns upon Christ, which is the name of a man, in
 “ which manner Chrysostom also understood this place.
 “ But he conceived that the world was created for Christ,
 “ a sense of the place which is not bad: but from the fore-
 “ going parts of the discourse, it is more proper to interpret
 “ the word *ἐκτίσθη* here, as signifying, constituted, or mo-
 “ delled, or that a new state of things was introduced.” † In
 like manner, Wetstein observes upon this place. “ If
 “ with the most skilful interpreters, we explain what is
 “ here said, by the parallel epistle to the Ephesians, we
 “ must understand these words, as speaking of the new
 “ creation and constitution of the world, by the coming
 “ of Christ, and preaching of the gospel.” ‡ The Socia-
 nians have always contended that this passage relates to
 the new creation: and their reasons for applying it in
 this manner, are as follows. 1, The one true God is
 always in scripture, declared to have made the heavens
 and the earth, nor is there there the smallest intimation
 given of any inferior agent being employed by him in the
 work of creation, excepting in this, or perhaps one or
 two passages more; which are capable of being otherwise
 explained, thus, Gen. i. 1 “ In the beginning God created
 the heaven and the earth.” Gen. i. 2. “ The Spirit
 (i. e. the breath, power, or energy) of God moved upon
 the face of the waters,” Isa. xxxvii. 16. “ O Lord
 of

“ † Certum est per verbum creata omnia. Sed quæ
 “ præcedunt, ostendunt hic de Christo regi, quod hominis
 “ est nomen, quomodo etiam Chrysostomus hunc accepit
 “ locum. Sed ille intelligit mundum creatum propter
 “ Christum, sensu non malo: sed propter id quod præcessit,
 “ rectius est christi hic interpretari, ordinati sunt, no-
 “ vam quendam statum sunt consecuta. Grotius in loco.
 “ ‡ Si ex epistola ad Ephesios interpretari debemus, quæ
 “ hic habentur, ut præstantissimi interpretes consentiunt,
 “ intelligenda hæc sunt de nova creatione, sive constitui-
 “ one mundi per adventum Christi, et prædicationem E-
 “ vangeliæ. Eph i. 10. ii. 10. 15. iii. 9. iv. 24. Wetstein
 “ in loco,

of hosts, God of Israel, that dwellest between the cherubims! Thou art God, even Thou alone, of all the kingdoms of the earth; Thou hast made heaven and earth," Isa. xlv. 24. "I am the Lord that maketh all things, that stretcheth forth the heavens alone, that spreadeth abroad the earth BY MYSELF." He. xlv. 11. 12. "Thus saith the Lord, the holy one of Israel, and his maker, ——— I have made the earth and created man upon it: I, even my hands, have stretched out the heavens." See also, Psal. xxxiii. 6. 9 and various other places in the Old Testament. In the New Testament also, God or the Father of Jesus, is declared to have been the maker of heaven and of earth. Acts iv. 24. 27. "And when they heard that, they lift up their voices to God with one accord, and said, Lord, thou art God, which hast made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that is in them;—For of a truth against THY holy child (or servant,) Jesus, &c." Acts xvii. 24. "God that made the world and all things therein, &c. and this place is certainly to be understood of the Father, for in Ver. 31. Christ is distinguished from God, "as a man whom he hath ordained." 2. Our Lord himself in all his discourses to his disciples, never in the least hinted, that he acted any part in the original creation. On the contrary speaking of our first parents he observes, Mark x. 6. "That from the beginning of the creation, God made them male and female, and he affirms the same still more strongly, Math. xix. 4. 3. It is the manner of the Hebrews to represent changes in the moral world, by images drawn from the natural world; and the gospel itself is prophesied of in the Old Testament, as a new creation, or renovation of things, Isa. li. 16. "And I have put my words in thy mouth, and have covered thee in the shadow of mine hand, that I may plant the heavens and lay the foundation of the earth, and say unto Zion, thou art my people." Isa. lxxv. 17. 18. "For behold, I create new heavens and a new earth; and the former ones shall not be remembered, nor come into mind. But be ye glad and rejoice for ever in that which I create; (or as

Bp. Lowth renders it, ye shall rejoice and exult in the age to come, which I create) for behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing and her people a joy " And Isaiah ix. 6. styles the Messiah "The Father of the everlasting age, or the age to come." In like manner the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us, Chap. ii. 5. "Unto the Angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, whereof we speak" 4. The Gospel dispensation itself is described by St. Paul as a new creation, 2 Cor. v. 17. "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: (Gr. KAINÈ KΤΙΣΙΣ, it is a new creation) old things are past away; behold, all things are become new" Eph. ii. 10. "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works." 5. The Greek word ΚΤΙΖΩ, here used by the Apostle, as well as the word BARA in Hebrew, may be rendered with the greatest propriety, to renew, repair, or restore, as well as, to create, thus, Psal. li. 10. "Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me." Ezekiel speaking of the city of Tyre, as a people or commonwealth says. Chap. xxviii. 15. "Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee." 1 Pet. ii. 13. "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man, (Gr. ΚΤΙΣΕΙ;) every creation of man:" and in several other places. 6. The creation here mentioned is ascribed to a man, a person who had been lately dead, and had shed his blood for the sake of mankind; Ver 14. "In whom we have redemption through his blood; even the forgiveness of sins" It cannot therefore say the Socinians, respect the original creation which Moses records; but must be restricted to the subject in hand, and understood

† The word ΚΤΙΖΩ has sometimes the same sense in classical writers. Herodotus speaking of the Isle of Platea says, "kai ektisoun Kurenaioi i. e. And the Cyrenians created it." Eusebius in like manner affirms, that "the Phenecians created Bithynia. The word *condo*, has a similar meaning in Latin, according to that well known line of Virgil.

Tantæ molis erat Romanam condere Gentem.

stood of the renovation of the world by Jesus Christ. And if we compare this part of the Epistle to the Colossians, with the corresponding passages in that to the Ephesians, referred to above, we shall find still more reason to be confirmed in this opinion—Eph i 7 10. “In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace——That in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are in earth, even in him.” What in the other Epistle is expressed by “all things that are in heaven and in earth being created by Christ,” is explained here. “by gathering together in one all things in Christ.” See also Eph. 17 to 23; where the glory and authority of Christ appears, to have been posterior to his resurrection from the dead. Eph. ii 10 15. “For we are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus, &c——having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments, contained in ordinances, for to make in himself, of twain, one new man, so making peace.” Ep iii 9 quoted before. See p. 226, &c. Ep iv. 24. “And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.” Taking Col. i. 15, &c. therefore as entirely relating to the new creation, or recovery of the world, the Socinians interpret it thus. “Who Christ is the image of the invisible God, the first born (not in time but dignity,) the chief, or most excellent, of every creature, for by him, and in order to be subjected to him, all things were created again, or renewed and restored, that are in heaven and in earth. Angels of different ranks and degrees, that were formerly hostile to mankind on account of their sins, are now in peace and friendship with them; and form a part of this new creation, or renovation by being subjected to the dominion of Christ, and ministering to the heirs of salvation. And Christ is before all things in excellence and worth, and directs and superintends every part of this new system, being the first born from the dead, the head of the christian church, according to the good pleasure of the Father, who hath caused all fulness

to dwell in him: or by him inhabits all fulness, i. e. qualifies him with proper powers for managing this vast authority, and extensive government; or by him exercises a spiritual dominion over Angels and Men." It is in this manner, the Socinians defend their application of this passage to the new creation; and their arguments deserve to be seriously and attentively considered. But whether it respects the old or the new creation; it cannot avail our opponents in the least, for the reasons before assigned.

Col. ii. 3 9. In whom (i. e. in Christ,) are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."—"For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and ye are complete in him, &c." There is no difficulty in explaining these passages, and they tend mutually to throw light upon one another. The fulness that dwelt in Christ, was the fulness of the Father, besides whose Godhead there is nor can be zone. And that fulness consisted in those treasures of wisdom and knowledge, which the Father imparted to Christ for the benefit of the church, and which rendered christians complete: so that they had no occasion for the instructions of Philosophers in religious matters, or to form themselves after the rudiments of the world, which might have a tendency to mislead them, and corrupt the purity of the faith. They had in Christ and his gospel, a far superior source of wisdom and knowledge. This observation might suffice to explain the meaning of the Apostle here. But as I have known some persons lay a stress upon the last passage, I shall here give the sentiments of an eminent commentator, who has explained it in a clear and satisfactory manner. " [Pan to pleroma tes Theotetos. All the fulness of the Godhead.] This expression does not signify all the perfections that belong to the Godhead; nor is that sense countenanced by any the like expression, that I can remember, in the whole bible. Indeed, the term fulness connotes some vessel wherein that fulness is contained, and that the fulness is somewhat different from the vessel which contains it; which may, for ought

" ought I know, be the reason why no such fulness is
 " ever attributed to God; but always when a fulness is
 " ascribed to him, it is that fulness wherewith he fills
 " other beings. The fulness therefore of the God-
 " head, I think, is not to be understood of any
 " immanent fulness of the Godhead, but of that
 " abundance of blessings wherewith the Godhead fills
 " us; just as we have a somewhat like phrase ver. 19.
 " " increaseth with the increase of God;" surely not
 " with any increase in the blessed God himself, but with
 " that increase which he effects and produces in us. It
 " is the same thing which he calls, all the fulness of God,
 " Eph. iii. 19. " That ye might be filled with all the
 " Fulness of God," i. e. all such fulness as God is wont
 " to bestow, a fulness not of one single gift, but of all
 " the gifts which are needful for Christians. In like
 " manner, Eph. i. 23. the church is called " the fulness
 " of him that filleth all in all, which I understand, as I
 " said before, of the Father; but supposing it meant of
 " the Son, it is still such a fulness as I speak of, not an
 " immanent, but a transient fulness, such a fulness where-
 " with he fills the church; and thus the fulness of Christ,
 " Eph. iv. 13. is to be explained in the same manner:
 " The fulness then of the Godhead, is that plenty of ex-
 " cellent gifts, which from the Godhead was communi-
 " cated to Christ, by him to be imparted to us, in order
 " to the filling us; it is, according to the Evangelists, a
 " " fulness of grace and truth," such " grace and truth
 " as came by Jesus Christ," and are received by us, John
 " i. 14 16 17. And thus this expression is much the
 " same in sense, with what he had used just before V. 3.
 " " In him are hid, all the treasures of wisdom and
 " knowledge." I can't tell, but that some may regard
 " the Judgement of St. Jerom; and therefore I will here
 " take notice, that he certainly had no apprehension, that
 " the fulness of the Godhead necessarily implied any such
 " sense as some have put upon it; nay, he must have al-
 " lowed that sense in which I have explained it; for
 " these are his words upon Gal. iii. 13. *Ille se de plen-*
itudinem

“ itudine et de forma Dei evacuavit, formam servi accip-
 “ iens, ut in nobis habitaret plenitudo divinitatis, et do-
 “ mini fieremus e servis, i, e. Christ emptied himself of
 “ the fulness and form of God, taking upon him the
 “ form of a servant, that the fulness of the Godhead
 “ might dwell in us, and we of servants might become
 “ Lords. Most agreeably to the explication I have given
 “ of the fulness of the Godhead, that dwelt in Christ,
 “ does St Paul immediately add, *kai este en auto peplerom-
 “ enoi*, which we have rendered, “ and ye are complete
 “ in him;” but it would have led the English reader
 “ much better into the Apostle’s thought, had it been
 “ rendered, “ And ye are filled by him. [*Somatikos.
 “ Bodily.*] that is, really and substantially, and not
 “ after the manner of types and shadows, &c.”

1 Tim. iii. 16. “ And without controversy, great is
 the mystery of Godliness. God was manifest in the flesh,
 justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the
 Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.”
 The gospel is here called a mystery of Godliness, or piety,
 because its pure and genuine doctrines, have a tendency
 to promote piety amongst men. It is not like the heathen
 mysteries, which were often impure and impious, and
 contributed to promote vice and wickedness. Its effects
 are quite of an opposite kind; and its precepts are calcu-
 lated to refine and enoble the heart of man, and lead him
 to the practice of all that is good and praise worthy.
 The gospel being called a mystery, does not imply, that
 its doctrines are inexplicable and contradictory, and in-
 capable of being fathomed or understood. For in that
 case they would be of no service to mankind, and would
 rather tend to generate strife, contention, and endless un-
 profitable controversy, than to advance piety and practical
 religion. The word mystery in scripture has never this
 meaning. It signifies only a thing once hidden, but ca-
 pable of being revealed and manifested. Thus, Rom.
 xvi. 25. 26. the gospel is styled, “ the revelation of
 the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began,
 but

† Mr Pierce of Exeter in loco.

but now is made manifest." The gospel is therefore a mystery or secret revealed, which implies that it is capable of being understood after it is revealed, and not that it is hidden or mysterious still. See also 1 Cor. ii. 7. 10, and iv. 1. Eph. i. 9. 10. iii. 3, to 10. Col. i. 26. 27. In which places the Gospel, and particularly God's purpose of calling the Gentiles, is called a mystery; because it was a secret, a thing hidden and not known, until God thought proper to reveal it: but when once revealed and published to the world at large, it ceased to be a secret or mystery any longer, and became a plain and manifest truth: and is only called a mystery because it was formerly hidden; and could not have been known but by divine revelation. As to the words, "God was manifest in the flesh;" if the word God was admitted to have been in this text originally, it would prove nothing more, but that the perfections of the Deity were displayed and manifested by Jesus Christ: that the wisdom of God shone forth in him, and became as it were conspicuous to mankind. And so this place is understood by Monsieur Abauzit, who considers it as a comment or explanation of the words of St John. "The word or wisdom was made flesh and dwelt among us." See Dis ix. p. 195. It is however more than propable, yea, I may venture to say it is absolutely certain, that the word THEOS, God, was not in this text as it came from the hands of St Paul. For the most ancient manuscripts read either HO, which, or HOS, he that; and the versions of greatest antiquity also read HO or HOS; as do the Fathers for at least four or five centuries after Christ, as Sir Isaac Newton has fully shewn, in a most learned and elaborate dissertation upon this passage, from which I shall give the following extract. "With the ancients versions agree the writers, both Greeks and Latins. For they in all their Discourses to prove the Deity of the Son, never alledge this text, (as I can find) as they would all have done; (and some of them frequently,) had they read "God was manifest in the flesh," and therefore they read ho.

" Tertullian

“ Tertullian (*adversus Praxeam*) and Cyprian (*adversus*
 “ *Judeos*) industriously cite all the places, where Christ
 “ is called God; but have nothing of this.—Alex-
 “ ander of Alexandria, Athanasius, the Bishops of the
 “ council of Sardica, Epiphanius, Basil, Gregory Naz-
 “ ianzen, Gregory Nyssen, Chrysostom, Cyril of Jeru-
 “ salem, Cyril of Alexandria; and amongst the Latins,
 “ Hilary, Lucifer, Jerome, Ambrose, Austin, Phæbadius,
 “ Victorinus Afer, Faustinus Diaconus, Pope Leo the
 “ great, Arnobius Junior, Cæcilius, Vigilius Tapsensis,
 “ Fulgentius, wrote all of them in the fourth and fifth
 “ centuries for the Deity of the Son, and incarnation of
 “ God; and some of them largely, and in several tracts;
 “ and yet I cannot find, that they ever alledge this text
 “ to prove it. In all the times of the hot and lasting
 “ Arian controversy, it never came into play: though
 “ now, that those disputes are over, they, that read,
 “ “God was manifest in the flesh,” think it one of the
 “ most obvious, and pertinent texts for the business.
 “ The churches therefore of those ages were absolute
 “ strangers to this reading. For, on the contrary,
 “ their writers, as often as they have occasion to
 “ cite the reading then in use, discover that
 “ it was ho. For though they cite it not to
 “ prove the Deity of the Son; yet in their commen-
 “ taries, and sometimes in their other discourses they
 “ produce it, &c.† In several of the Fathers the
 word *THEOS*, has been since their time inserted into the
 text itself, in their works; but as Dr. Clark remarks, and
 Sir Isaac Newton has proved, it appears from the tenor of
 their commentaries, that it was not originally so. Dr.
 “ Clark also observes that of the two passages cited to
 “ the contrary by the learned Dr. Mill’s, in his Appen-
 “ dix; that from Justin Martyr does not prove he did,
 “ but rather that he did not, read it *THEOS*; and
 “ that from Athanasius, is out of a book acknowledged
 “ to be spurious.—And in the days of Julian, when
 that

† Two letters of Sir Isaac Newton to Mr Le Clerc
 p. 85. 86. J. Payne London 1754.

“ that Emperor asserted that “ neither Mathew, Mark, Luke, nor Paul, ever ventured to stile Christ, God;” “ ’tis plain from Cyrill’s answer, to this assertion of Julian, that even at that time the word (THEOS) was “ not found in this text.” § The true reading of this place therefore appears to be either “ Great is the Mystery of Godliness, which was manifest in the flesh, &c.” (if HO is adopted;) or “ he that was manifest in the flesh, &c.” (if HOS is follow’d.) † We now proceed to the consideration of other objections.

1 Tim. vi. 13 to 61. “ I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Jesus Christ, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession; that thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ: which in his times he shall shew, who is the blessed and only potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords: who only hath immortality dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting, Amen.

It is

§ Dr. Clarke’s works Vol. 4. p. 47. 48, Lond. 1738.

† The manuscripts which read either hos, or he, are, the Ephrem, Claramontaine, those called, Borellii, and Wolfii, and another. In the judgement of Wetstein and others, the Alexandrian manuscript also formerly read in the same manner, but has been changed into Theos by some unknown hand: but Bower has started some doubts on this subject. The Vulgate, both Syriac versions, the Coptic, Armenian, and Ethiopic versions, also read either, hos, or he. On the other hand, there are upwards of fifty manuscripts that read THEOS. But as none of them are older than the tenth century, and many of them later, they cannot be opposed to the reading of the ancient Mss. the oldest and best versions; and the unanimous consent of the primitive church for five centuries after Christ. See Wetstein, Grisebach, Dr. Clark, Dr. Benson, and Bower in loco, also Sir Isaac Newton’s letters, &c. quoted above.

It is perfectly clear and evident from the construction of this passage, that it is the Father and not Jesus Christ, that is here styled "the blessed and only potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of Lords:" and who will shew, or cause Jesus Christ appear at the general Judgement. The Father is described as one "whom no man hath seen or can see:" but this would not be true of Jesus Christ, who was seen by many in this world: and after his ascension, by Stephen and Paul: and who will be seen, or shewn, to the whole world at the last day. It is therefore surprising, that any should have mistaken this place so far, as to apply the peculiar characters of the Father to Jesus Christ.

Titus ii. 13. "Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ." The Greek words, *epiphaneian tes doxes tou megalou theou*, should have been rendered, "the appearance of the glory of the great God;" and then it would have appeared, that Jesus Christ is not here called "the great God;" but that it is only affirmed, that a representation, or appearance of the glory of the great God, viz. the Father, shall attend Christ when he comes to judgement. And this is agreeable to what our Lord himself tells us, Luke ix. 26. "The Son of Man, ——— shall come in his own glory, and in his Father's, and of the holy Angels." See also 2 Thes. i. 7 to 10. It is beyond a doubt therefore, that it is the Father, that is in this place styled, "the great God."

Heb. i. 2. 3. "God who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the Fathers by the Prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds: who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, &c." Jesus Christ or the Son is in this place plainly distinguished from the Father, who is styled God absolutely. God is also declared to have appointed the Son, "heir of all things," and in ver. 4. of this chapter the Son is said to have

have been, "made so much better than the Angels as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they:" which expressions are only applicable to a dependent being; and by no means compatible with proper Godhead. Indeed the drift of this whole chapter and the following one, is to prove the superior excellence of Christ to Angels; which if Christ had been God, would have been so much needless labour in the author of this Epistle. For every person must have perceived at once, that the Deity, the creator of Angels, and all other Beings, was infinitely superior to his own creatures. It is here said, that (di' hou, by or through whom) viz, "by the Son also God made the worlds." Admitting the propriety of this translation, and applying it to the original creation, it will only prove, that the Son was an inferior agent under the one true God in the formation of the world. See p. 213. and Dis. ix p. 182. 183. The original word *aionas*, however, signifies more properly ages, than worlds, agreeably to the remark of a great critic: whose words I shall here transcribe "The word *aionas*, which
 " we render worlds, does not signify the heavens and the
 " earth and all things in them, but it means properly
 " ages, or certain periods of time, in which such and
 " such things were done or to be done. Such were the
 " patriarchal; that of the law; that of the Messiah; that
 " of the Antediluvians; that of the four great empires,
 " which the prophet Daniel spoke of These were proper-
 " ly *aiones*, ages. — It does not follow from the words of
 " this passage, that the apostle here intended to speak of
 " Christ's making all things. — Nor is there any one instance
 " in the N. Testament, where more than this seems to be
 " meant by this word. " Thus Col. i. 26. " the my-
 " stery which hath been hid from ages and generations,
 " but now is made manifest to his saints," is the true
 " explication of what St. Paul said, Eph. iii. 9. was
 " hid in God (not from the beginning of the world, as
 " we render it, but) *apo ton aionon*, " from the ages,"
 " And so Eph. iii. 11. what we render: " his eternal
 " purpose," *kata prothesin ton aionon*, is, " according
 " to his

“ to his purpose or disposition of the ages.” vid. Heb. xi. 3. † “ According to this explication of the word *aionas*, the passage will stand thus, “ by whom also he (God) made the ages;” which some will understand of all the different dispensations of providence, and periods of time since the creation; and others restrict to those ages that followed the Gospel, (viz. the age to come of which Christ was the Father, or author,) according, as they either admit or reject the pre-existence of Christ. Grotius remarks here “ It appears to me that *di’ hon* in this place “ may be rightly taken for *di’ hon*, “ for whom &c.”— “ But what recommends this interpretation greatly to me “ is, that the author of this Epistle writing to the Hebrews, seems to allude to an old saying amongst them, “ viz. that the world was made for the *Messias*.” † If the criticism of this learned writer is admitted, the true rendering of the place will be this, “ for whom God made the ages,” that is, he arranged and disposed all the different periods of time, with a view to his Son, the *Messiah*, and in order to introduce that age, or more perfect dispensation, of which he was to be the author. The Son is also affirmed to be here,) *apaugasma tes doxas, kai karakter tes hypostaseos autou*) a ray of of his (God’s) glory, and the very image or impression of his substance; which expression is so far from affording any ground, for inferring the divinity of Christ, or his equality with the Father, that the very contrary may be proved from it. For a ray darting from a luminous body, is not to be compared to the luminous body itself, which is the source or cause of the ray. All mankind may be said to be rays of God’s glory, inasmuch as the glory of the creator, appears

† Dr. Sykes in loco.

† Videtur *di’ hon* hic recte accipi posse pro *di’ hon*, “ propter quem &c.”— Ideo autem hæc interpretatio hoc loco maxime mihi se probat, quia ad Hebræos scribens videtur respicere ad dictum vetus Hebræorum, propter *Messiam* conditum esse mundum. Grotius in loco.

pears in all his works, and we derive every thing we possess from him. Much more may the Son be so called; in whom the glory of God appears more conspicuously than in any other being. When Christ is called, the very or express image of the substance of God, this plainly distinguishes him from that God whose image he is; and by no means implies that the substance, or essence, of God is in him, but the contrary. For if the substance of the Father had been in Christ, he would not have been the image of that substance: but would have been the substance itself. Adam and all his posterity are said to have been made in the image and likeness of God: it is not wonderful therefore, that Christ in whom the wisdom and power of the Father so eminently dwelt, should be called his very or express image. It is further said of the Son "that he upholds all things by the word of his power:" which must be understood of the Father's power communicated to the Son, by which Christ is qualified to govern his church and people. In confirmation of this explication, I shall here give the words of a learned writer. "The
 " common way of expounding the expression, is, that
 " the Son upholds all things by the word of his own power. And accordingly our printed copies have here
 " *autou*, and not *patris*. And 'tis urged that the Mss.
 " copies, which have accents added, read it with an aspiration. But none of the ancient Mss. having any
 " accents at all, every reader is at liberty to affix such
 " Spirits as appear most agreeable to the scope of any
 " text. And it is easy to observe that our author in this
 " verse, distinguishes *autou* and *heutou*; and therefore as *autou* just before relates to the Father, it is reasonable to judge it does so here also. The sense given
 " by any of the ancient Greek commentators, can signify
 " little in this case, because as they lived after these matters were warmly controverted, they would adapt the
 " Spirits to the serving of their own hypothesis: so that
 " their reasons, and not their authority, can only be of
 " any moment in the case." †

Heb.

† Mr. Pierce of Exeter in loco.

Heb. i. 5. "For unto which of the Angels said he at any time, thou art my Son this day have I begotten thee, &c." See Dis. viii. p. 126. 127.

Heb. i. 6. "And again when he bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, he saith, and let all the Angels of God worship him." Explained, Dis. viii. p. 131. 132.

Heb. i. 8. 9. "But unto the Son, he saith, thy throne O God is for ever and ever, &c." Explained, Dis. viii. p. 127. 128. 129.

Heb. i. 10. 11. 12. "And, thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, &c." These verses relate to God the Father, and not to Christ. See Dis. viii. p. 132. 133.

Heb. ii. 16. "For verily, he (Christ) took not on him the nature of Angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham." This place is more properly rendered in the margin of the bible; "he taketh not hold of Angels, but of the seed of Abraham he taketh hold:" which some understand to signify, he helped not Angels, but he helped the seed of Abraham, that is, the grace and mercy of the Gospel, does not extend to the benefit of Angels, but only of mankind.

Heb. iii. 3. 4. "For this man was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath builded the house, hath more honour than the house. For every house is builded by some man; but he that built all things is God. The house that Christ is here said to build, is not any material fabric, but the church, of which he is the founder and the head: thus in ver. 6. of this chapter we are told that, "Christ (was faithful) as a Son over his own house: whose house are we, viz the christian people. He that is said "to build all things," is God the Father: who appointed or (as the Greek word (*poietanti*) may be rendered) made Christ: and to whom Christ, the Apostle and High priest of our profession, is faithful or obedient. See Ver. 1. 2.

Heb. iv. 12. "For the word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two edged sword, &c.

The

The word of God here mentioned, is not Jesus Christ, but the gospel or law of God, which is exceeding broad; and extends to the inmost thoughts as well the external actions, and by which word, all mankind shall be judged at the last day.

Heb. vii. 3. "Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the son of God, abideth a priest continually." These words being evidently spoken of Melchisedec, have properly no connection with our present subject. Christ certainly had God for his Father, and the Virgin Mary for his Mother: and was raised to the dignity of high priest by God the Father; Heb. v. 5. "So also Christ glorified not himself, to be made an high priest; but he that said unto him, thou art my Son, to day have I begotten thee."

Heb. xiii. 8. "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever." This passage from the scope of the context, evidently relates, not to the person, but the doctrines of Christ, ver. 7. "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God: whose faith follow considering the end of their conversation." And again, ver. 9. "Be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines." The true meaning of this place therefore is, that the doctrines of Christ, or the Revelation of the Gospel, continues invariably the same, and cannot be changed or altered, by the humours and caprice of men; and that Christians ought to adhere to the original standard of their religion, and not suffer themselves to be seduced from it, and led astray, by the delusive arts of false and erroneous teachers. It can never be affirmed of the person of Christ, that it is the same to day, yesterday, and for ever. For our Lord has undergone various changes, and has been in very different situations. He lived in this world as a man, suffered death, was raised from the dead by the Father, ascended up into heaven, was advanced to a state of the highest dignity there; and
will

will at the consummation of all things, deliver up the Kingdom to the Father.

1 Peter i. 11. " Searching (viz the Prophets) what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." The Spirit of God the Father, or the Holy Spirit, is here called the Spirit of Christ in a secondary sense, because it was imparted to him without measure, and by him conferred upon the Apostles, and first converts to the Christian faith. It was this same spirit or inspiration of God, that formerly dwelt in the Prophets; and which revealed to them what Christ was to do and suffer for the benefit of Mankind, and the glory that was to follow from his sufferings. But that the Spirit of God, or the Holy Spirit, properly belongs to God the Father only, we have before fully shewn. † See Discourse ix. p. 175. 176.

2 Pet. i. 1. " Through the righteousness of God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ." Some are for rendering these words from the Greek, " through the knowledge of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ;" and as the pronoun (hemon) is not repeated, they will bear this translation; which if it were admitted would only prove, that Jesus Christ may be called God, or our God, in the inferior sense. But from the words that follow in the 2 verse " through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord;" as well as from the uniform style of the Apostolical Epistles, it is far more natural to render them as our Translators have done. In two Mss. the pronoun is repeated, and the Syriac Version, has in this place Lord, instead of God. †

2 Pet. ii. 1. " But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even

† One Ms. in this place reads the Spirit of God in place of Christ; but this is to slight an authority to authorize a change in the common reading.

† See Mill and Griesbach in loco,

even denying the Lord that bought them, &c. The original Greek word, which our Translators have here rendered Lord, is not *Kurios*, but *Despotes*, which signifies the Sovereign, or absolute Lord of the Universe; and is always applied to the Father, but never to Christ in the New Testament. It is the same word that is used, Acts iv. 24. "Lord, (Gr. *Despote*, Sovereign Lord,) thou art God which hast made heaven and earth, &c.:" and Jude, ver. 4. *ton monon Despoten Theon*, "The only Sovereign Lord God." The damnable heresies here mentioned, probably relate to the opinions of the Nicolaitans, Gnostics, &c; who corrupted the principles of Christianity, and were guilty of many immoral practices. God the Father is declared in scripture to have bought both Jews and Christians: Deut. xxxii. vi. "Is he not thy Father that hath bought thee?" 1 Cor. vi. 20. Ye are bought with a price, therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's." Some Trinitarians misunderstanding the words, "denying the Lord that bought them," and considering them as applicable to our Lord Jesus Christ, have been so weak and malicious as to charge the Unitarians with such a denial: although they own him to be Lord, and the son of God also, in the true sense in which these titles are given him in scripture. But as the word *Despotes* respects the Father, the Unitarians have here a good title to return the charge upon their opponents, and to accuse them of denying the only Sovereign Lord God of the Universe, viz the Father, by giving away his peculiar glory to another, and making other Gods or supreme beings besides him, who is the only living and true God. If any speculative opinion whatever may be called, "a damnable heresy," this horrid tenet of the Trinitarians, seems to have the best right to that appellation.

1 John i. 1. 2. "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the word of life. (For the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal

eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us, &c.'). Jesus Christ is in this place called the word of life, because he was the revealer of the Father's will, and the author of the Gospel dispensation. The knowledge of eternal life, or immortality, was before his coming with the Father, i. e. hidden as it were and concealed from the greatest part of mankind; but Jesus Christ manifested it, and brought it to light by his Gospel. This place does not afford even the shadow of an argument in favour of our opponents.

1 John iii, 16. "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us, &c." The word God in this text is wanting in all the Greek Mss. excepting one or two at most. It is left out by Walton, Curellæus, Mill, Wetstein, Harwood, Griesbach, &c. in their editions of the Greek Testament; and being evidently spurious, ought to be expunged from our English Bible. The true reading of the place is this, "Hereby perceive we (Gr. *agapen*) love, because he (viz. Christ who is understood,) laid down his life for us."

1 John iv. 3. "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God: and this is that spirit of Antichrist, &c." Jesus Christ coming in the flesh, or appearing as a man, is no proof at all of divinity but the contrary. These words of the Apostle were pointed at the Docetæ, a sect of early Heretics, who taught that Jesus had not a real body or was not truly a man. If Christ had been God, he could not have been incarnate, or have come in the flesh; and therefore the Trinitarians who affirm that he was so, and thereby render his coming in the flesh impossible, appear to join issue with these ancient heretics, and fall under the censure of the Apostle in this place.

1 John v. 7. 8. "For there are three that bear record (in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy-Ghost; and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth,) the spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one." The words in parenthesis, have been fully proved by many able writers

to be spurious, and Father Simon, Dr Wall, Proffessor Michaelis, and other learned Trinitarians, have acknowledged them to be so. They are wanting in all the Greek manuscripts, excepting two, which are of no authority. They are not quoted by any of the Greek Fathers, in any work which is allowed to be genuine, although some of them quote the verses immediately before and after. Nor do any of the Latin Fathers quote this text for several centuries after Christ. During the time of the Arian controversy, this text was never produced, altho' the whole Bible was ransacked, and many passages far less to the purpose were urged as proofs of the divinity of Christ. These words are wanting in the Syriac, Arabic, Coptic, Ethiopic, and Armenian versions, and although they are in the Latin Vulgate, yet many Mss. of that version also want them. Luther, and Bullinger, omitted them in their translations of the German Bible at the time of the reformation: and in the English Bibles in the reigns of Henry the eighth, and Edward the sixth, they were either printed in a different character, or separated by a parenthesis: or both; as also in one edition in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. This passage was left out in several famous editions of the Greek Testament printed about the time of the reformation, viz. in the first and second of Erasmus, in one of Aldus, those of Wolfius Cephalius, and Colinaeus, and one printed at Haguenau, and another at Strasburg; and several Dutch editions which followed them. And Harwood, and Griesbach, in their late editions of the New Testament have also omitted them. In favour of the genuineness of this passage have been alleged;—the authority of two Greek Mss.;—the testimonies of Tertullian, Cyprian, and Jerom; some spurious works in Greek, and Victor Vitensis, and Vigilius Thapsensis &c. who lived about the end of the fifth century. As to the two Greek Mss the one of them hardly deserves to be called a Ms. being a mere copy of the Complutense edition even to the errors of the press, written since the invention of printing: and is lodged in the king of Prussia's library at Berlin: and the other which belongs to the University

University of Dublin, is in the opinion of the best Judges a mere modern Manuscript, of no value or accuracy. Tertullian does not allude to this passage at all, but only gives his own sentiments, and refers to John x. 30; which he would never have done had this passage been extant in his time. The words of Cyprian, as we are assured from the testimonies of Eusebius, and Facundus, are only a mystical interpretation of the 8 verse, which prevailed in the African church: and the preface which has been ascribed to St. Jerome, in which this text is mentioned and asserted to have been restored by him, has been itself proved to be spurious. Works confessedly counterfeited, are of no authority to establish the genuineness of any passage: and the testimonies of Victor Vitensis and other Latin writers in the end of the fifth century, are too late in time to be regarded. In short from the universal consent of the Greek Mss. the silence of all the Greek, and the earliest Latin writers, the omission of this place in all the ancient versions, (the vulgate excepted which is divided in regard to it,) there is no doubt but that the words included in the parenthesis above, have been either wilfully, or ignorantly, thrust into the sacred text; and they ought therefore to be erased from our Bibles, that they may no longer deceive the ignorant; who in this place as well as some others, read the words of men instead of the words of God. † It has been asserted, that the sense of the Apostle is not perfect, without these words. But on the contrary, this interpolation rather darkens the tenor of the Apostles discourse, and
breaks

† It was for sometime imagined, that seven of Stephen's Manuscripts had this passage: but on a stricter scrutiny it has been found, that these seven want the first Epistle of John altogether. The above is a brief but just account of this passage, and the reasons for rejecting it. The subject is discussed at large in Mill, Wetstein, and Griesbach in loco. In Sir Isaac Newton's letters to Le Clerc, Dr. Beason's Dissertation; and above all the rest, in Mr. Emlyn's full enquiry into this text, and his Defences of that enquiry in reply to Mr Martia.

breaks its connexion. What occasion is there for witnesses in heaven? The Messiahship of Jesus is unquestionably admitted there. The Spirit is also made a witness both in heaven and earth, which reduces the six witnesses to five, and is inconsistent even with the interpolation itself. But when the passage is read according to the Greek Manuscripts, the sense is quite regular and clear, and runs in the following manner Ver. 6. "This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the spirit that beareth witness, because the spirit is truth. For there are three that bear record, the spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one;" viz. one testimony, that Jesus is the son of God. Some understand by the water and the blood, the blood and water that came from the side of our Lord when he was pierced upon the cross; but others more properly, refer the water to the baptism of Jesus, when he was declared by a voice from heaven to be the beloved son of God; or to the spotless purity and innocence of the life and character of our Lord, compared to water on that account; and the blood to his death and resurrection, by which he was declared or defined to be the son of God with power. The spirit evidently relates to the miracles performed by Christ and his Apostles, and the supernatural gifts bestowed upon them; by which our Lord's divine mission and sonship, were ascertained to the world. So that all these three witnesses concur in one testimony. And St John adds with great propriety, ver. 9. "If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater; for this is the witness of God, which he hath testified of his son." If we admit the testimony or evidence of two or three persons of veracity to establish the truth of any fact, ought we not much rather to admit the testimony that God has given in behalf of his Son, particularly the miraculous works and gifts, which being performed by the spirit or power of God, may be called the very witness or evidence of God himself.

John v. 20 21. "And we know that the son of God
is

is come, and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life. Little children, keep yourselves from idols. Amen. The word **EVEN** in the 20 verse, is an arbitrary and unnecessary insertion of our translators, which darkens the sense of the passage, and has a tendency to mislead the reader. Take it away, and the sense is quite clear. "And we are in him that is true, in or by his son Jesus Christ." "This is the true God and eternal life." that is, this God, viz. the Father, in whom we are by Jesus Christ, is the true God; and eternal life or a blessed immortality, is his gift by Jesus Christ, or the happy consequence of being in him. The Alexandrian, and eleven other Manuscripts, with the Vulgate, Coptic, Arabic, and Ethiopic Versions, and some early Editions of the Greek Testament, have in the 20 verse, *alethinon Theon*, "the true God," in place of "him that is true." † For a more particular explication of this place turn to Discourse 1. p. 5. 6.

Jude Verse 4 — "Denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ. The word God in this place, is wanting in the Alexandrian, Ephrem, and ten other Mss. in the Vulgate and Coptic Versions, and in the writings of several Fathers. Gronius, Hammond, Mill, and Bengelius are of opinion that it should be set aside; and Griesbach, and Harwood have actually omitted it, in their Editions of the Greek Testament. But whither we read here *Ton monon Despoten*, "the only Sovereign Lord," or *ton monon Despoten Theon* "the only Sovereign Lord God, it is as clear as the Sun, that it is the Father that is so called, and not Christ; for he is afterwards distinguished by the title of *Kurion hemon Jesou Christou*, "our Lord Jesus Christ;" and the particle *kai* is not in this place copulative but disjunctive. Jesus Christ is the Lord or master of christians, made so by the Father; but can never be called, "the only Sovereign Lord;" because there is one greater than he, who made him

† Wetstein in loco.

him both Lord and Christ †: and to whose glory he is only to be acknowledged as Lord. † The ungodly persons here mentioned, who turned the grace of God unto lasciviousness, were probably the Nicolaitans, Gnostics, and other heretics, who corrupted the doctrines of Christianity, both in regard to the Father and the Son; and seem to be the same persons to whom St Peter alludes 2 Ep. Chap. ii ver. 1. The Trinitarians also may be justly said to deny, or dishonour the only Sovereign Lord of the Universe, who is the Father, because they acknowledge two other persons or agents, to be equal with him in power and in glory.

Jude, Ver 24. 25. "Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory, with exceeding joy, to the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen." It is the Father that is here styled "the only wise God our Saviour." The Father has also this title, Titus i, 3. ii. 10. and iii. 4. in which last place, if we compare the 4 and 6 verses together, we shall find that the construction necessarily restrains it to the Father. And well may the Father be so called, for he is our Saviour in the sublimest sense of the word. Christ came in the name of the Father to save us, and our salvation takes its first rise from the Father: for "of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption. 1 Cor. i. 30. But what appropriates the title of, "the only wise God our Saviour," to the Father beyond all dispute, is this, that the Alexandrian, Vatican, Ephrem, and twelve other Manuscripts, with the Vulgate, both Syriac, Coptic, and Arabic versions, read in this place after the words, "God our Saviour," *dia Jesou Christou tou Kurion hemon*, through our Lord Jesus Christ. § These words therefore, as they are supported

† Acts ii. 36.

‡ Phil. ii. 11.

§ Wetstein and Griesbach in loco.

supported by so great authority, ought to have a place in our Bibles: and so the last verse of St. Jude will stand thus; "to the only wise God our Saviour, through Jesus Christ our Lord, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever, Amen."

Rev i. 8. "I am alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord; which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." The Alexandrian, (Vatican, as noted by Griesbach,) Ephrem, and seventeen other Manuscripts, according to Wettstein, with the Vulgate, Syriac, Coptic, and Arabic Versions, some Fathers, the Complutense edition, and the editions of Plantin, Bengelius, and Harwood; have in this place, *Kurios ho Theos*, "the Lord God" and this appears to be the true reading of the place, viz. "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending saith the Lord God &c."† Although the 6. and 7. verses of this chapter respect our Lord Jesus Christ; yet this eight verse entirely relates to the Father. And this will appear evident, if we consider that this book of Revelation itself, is styled the Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him; in which words Christ is plainly distinguished from God, and is said to receive this Revelation from him. God the Father is therefore the author of this Revelation of future events; and is characterised by St. John in the 4 verse, as "he which is, and which was, and which is to come;" and Jesus Christ is styled in the 5 verse "the faithful witness and the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth;" which titles are only applicable to a creature and dependent being: St. John having therefore, distinguished the Father in the very beginning of his Revelation, by the sublime title of "him which is, and which was, and which is to come," (which words denote the eternal duration of the supreme being,) it is certain that when these words occur again in the 8 Verse, that they must necessarily be understood of the Father. The 7 verse is concluded with an Amen, and in the eighth, God the Father the original author of this Revelation.

† Wettstein and Griesbach in loco.

Revelation, is introduced again as speaking; and in the 11 verse the Apostle returns to speak of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is therefore a sad perversion of Scripture, to apply the eighth verse of this chapter to our Lord Jesus Christ, when, it is so clearly evident, from the tenor of the Apostles discourse, and the manner of his expression; that it belongs only to the Father, than whom no other being can be called the Lord God, or the Almighty.

John i. 11. "I am Alpha, and Omega, the first and last and." These words are spurious although the rest of the verse is genuine. For they are wanting, in the Alexandrian, Ephrem, and fifteen other Manuscripts; in the Vulgate, Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, and Ethiopic versions; and are left out in the Complutense edition, and in the editions of Plantin, Bengelius, Harwood, and Griesbach, and set aside also by Dr. Mill. This clause therefore ought to be struck out of our Bibles; and the 10 and 11 verses should run as follows: "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day; and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet, saying, what thou seest, write in a book, &c.

Rev. i. 17. 18. "Fear not, I am the first and the last: I am he that liveth and was dead, &c." Much unmeaning and puerile declamation has been employed by some Trinitarian writers, in regard to the expression, "the first and the last," which our Lord in this place declares himself to be. Because Almighty God in various places of scripture is styled, "the first and the last;" it is therefore inferred by these penetrating critics, that Jesus Christ must be God also, because he makes use of this expression concerning himself. But when this title is applied to God, it is always joined with some of the characters and attributes of the supreme being; and denotes his unequalled Majesty, and eternal existence without beginning or end. See Isa. xlv 6. Rev. i. 8. "However in this place, it unfortunately happens for the cause of our opponents, that this title is connected with such circumstances, as are only applicable to a creature, and cannot without blasphemy be ascribed

bed to God. " I am (says our Lord) the first and the last. I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore; Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death." Again, Rev ii. 8. " These things saith the first and the last, which was dead and is alive &c." Jesus Christ is therefore only " the first and the last," in such a sense as is compatible to a created being viz one " who was dead and is alive " Nay he has here explained in what sense he is " the first and the last." He was the last when he died and suffered the ignominious punishment of the cross: and he was the first or the most exalted of all creatures, when he became alive for evermore, and had the keys of hell and death entrusted to him, and had a name given him that is above every name. Our Lord then having defined and ascertained himself, in what sense he is " the first and the last:" no man has a right to put a different construction upon his words; and all the fanciful reasoning of these noisy declaimers, is only a play of words without any solid foundation.

Rev. ii. 23. " I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts: and I will give unto every one of you according to your works." The knowledge of the human heart is in several places of Scripture, declared to belong to God. See Psal. vii. 9. Jerem. xi. 20: and in Solomon's noble prayer at the dedication of the temple, this knowledge is said to be peculiar to God; and Jerem. xviii. 10, the divine being claims it as his prerogative, and distinguishing glory. It has therefore been concluded by Trinitarians, that when Jesus Christ ascribes a like knowledge to himself, he must be possessed of the same nature and attributes as the Father; or according to their Dialect, be one God with him. But although the knowledge of the reins and heart, belongs properly and primarily to God alone; yet we find several instances in holy scripture, in which this power has been conferred upon others. Elisha the prophet, searched and knew the heart of his servant Gehazi, 2 Kings v, 26. " Went not mine heart with thee." Again, 2 Kings

vi. 12. it is affirmed of the same person. "Elisha the prophet, that is in Israel, telleth the king of Israel the words that thou speakest in thy bed-chamber;" and Elisha tells Hazael, 2 Kings viii. 12. "I know the evil that thou wilt do unto the children of Israel." And in Acts Chap. v. we find the Apostle Peter, possessing the knowledge of the hearts of Ananias, and Sapphira. If then the Prophets and Apostles, by a power derived from God, could search the reins and heart, and know and tell the most secret thoughts that pass in peoples' minds, even at a distance from them: why should it be urged as an argument for the divinity of Christ, that he possessed a superior degree of the same knowledge? But our opponents may perhaps here reply, that the Prophets and Apostles were acquainted with the heart only by revelation, or a derived power; but that Jesus Christ knows the heart by a natural and inherent power of his own. This assertion however is flatly contradictory to the uniform tenor of the word of God, wherein we are told, that our Lord derives his very being and all his powers from the Father; and consequently the capacity of searching the human heart as well as the rest. And when the Father gave our Lord authority to execute judgement because he was the son of man; † it was necessary that the knowledge of the heart and reins should be laid open to him: for without it he would not have been qualified to be the judge of the world; and could not have rendered to every man according to his works. Our Lord therefore, searches the reins and hearts with a view to the future judgement; and that by a power as much derived from God the Father, as any of the Prophets or Apostles did: and this will appear past dispute if we take his whole words in connection, and read on to the 26 and 27 verses of this chapter, "And he that overcometh and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations: (and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers:) even as I received of my Father.

Rev.

† John v. 27.

Rev. iii. 7. " These things saith he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth and no man shutteth, and shutteth and no man openeth,; &c." These words are an allusion to Isa. xxii. 22. and are expressive of the excellence of our Lord's character, in which holiness and truth eminently appeared, and the great dignity to which our Lord is advanced in the heavenly world, having a power conferred upon him, that none can controul or resist; but there is nothing here that indicates Divinity, or equality with the God and Father of all. On the contrary in this chapter, ver 12. Christ styles the Father four times " my God;" and in Ver. 14. he calls himself, " the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God;" and adds in ver. 21. " To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne. All which expressions are only suitable to a creature, and cannot without impiety be applied to the ever blessed God. It has been weakly argued by some, that Christ being described as sitting with the Father in his throne, is a proof of his equality with the Father. But as Christ promises that the Saints, or " those who overcome," shall sit with him on his throne, and as his throne is that of the Father; this method of arguing would prove that the Saints were equal to Christ, yea to God himself. The truth however is, that these expressions both in regard to Christ, and the Saints, are only metaphorical, and denote nothing more, but that illustrious reward which he received, and they also in their turn shall receive, if in imitation of their great master, they shall overcome the temptations of the world, and persevere in doing the will of God to the end.

Rev. v. 5. 6. " Behold the Lion of the tribe of Juda, the root of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof. And I beheld, and lo, in the midst of the throne, and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders stood a Lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns, and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God sent forth into all the earth." Our Lord in this place may be called the root of David, because
he

He was descended and sprung from him, as a root springs out of the earth. Or he may be called the root or support of David, because he was David's Lord, and the object of his faith. The book of the decrees of God, containing the knowledge of future events, was given to our Lord, as the most excellent and worthy of all the inhabitants of heaven; and he is justly celebrated by the four beasts, and elders on that account. But his receiving this book, or having the knowledge of future events communicated to him, is a plain proof that he is not God; for if he had been God, or an omniscient being, all futurity must have been open to him; and he could not have received the knowledge of it from any. Our Lord is described as standing in the midst of the throne, which represents his high dignity and exalted station in the heavenly kingdom; but throughout this whole book of Revelation, there is a great and remarkable distinction made, betwixt Christ, "and him that sitteth upon the throne," who is the Father. So that it is impossible for any body who reads this book with attention, not to discover from it, the supreme independent character of the Father, who alone is the Lord God Almighty; and the subordinate and inferior nature of our Lord Jesus Christ; who was slain, and redeemed mankind to God by his blood: and is therefore declared to be worthy, "to take the book, and to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing. Rev. v. 9. 12. But the Father, the only true God, who sitteth upon the throne and liveth for ever and ever, who cannot suffer or die, is extolled on account of his own undriven, original, and inherent dignity, Rev. iv. 8. 11. "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come——Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are, and were created. "The seven horns, and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God," that the Lamb is said to have, denote his knowledge of human affairs, communi-
cated

ated to him by God; or perhaps may relate to the ministry of angels.

Rev. xvii. 14 ——" And the Lamb shall overcome them: for he is Lord of lords and King of kings, &c." Rev. xix. 13. 16. " And his name is called, the word of God. — And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of kings and Lord of lords." — Our Lord Jesus Christ is called the Word of God, because he was the revealer of the Father's will, as we before observed. And in the passages we have just now quoted, he is twice called, " King of kings and Lord of lords." In 1 Tim. vi. 15. this title is applied to the Father: but it is there connected with other expressions of dignity peculiar to God only. It by no means follows, that because Jesus Christ as well as the Father, is styled, " King of kings and Lord of lords," that therefore he is God equal with the Father. For the same title may be, and is given in scripture, in very different senses, and must always be understood and explained according to the nature of that being to whom it is applied. Thus the word God, when applied to Angels, Kings, Judges, &c. is to be understood in a manner infinitely different than when it denotes Jehovah the God of Israel. — Our Lord Jesus Christ then, is only King of kings in such a sense as is consistent with that declaration of God concerning him, Psal. ii. 6. " Yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Sion; and he is Lord of lords also, only in such a sense as is compatible to one who was made Lord by the Father; Acts ii. 36. " Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." In a word Jesus Christ in consequence of his exaltation in heaven, and his being appointed by the Father the judge of the whole world, may be very properly called, " King of kings and Lord of lords;" because he is superior to all to whom these titles are given (God alone excepted) being the Prince of the kings of the earth. Rev. i. 5. But still there is a great and amazing difference betwixt him and the Father, who made Christ both King and Lord in this exalted

exalted sense; and is himself not only King of kings and Lord of lords, in a sense far superior to Christ; but is also God of gods, Deut. x 17, Psal. cxxxvi. 2. and the God and Father of Christ himself, to whom he is altogether subjected, and upon whom he is entirely dependent. John xx 17. Eph. i. 3. 1 Peter i. 3. Rev. iii. 12.

Rev. xxi 6 "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end." These words were uttered by him who sat upon the throne, Ver. 5. which title always denotes the Father in this Book of Revelation; and consequently they are not the words of Christ, but of God.

We have now completed the last part of our plan, and have given a full and particular reply to the objections of Trinitarians, drawn from the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of St Paul and others, and the Revelation of St John. In the preceding discourse, we obviated the objections which are supposed to occur in the Evangelists. Upon the whole, the sacred books of the New Testament afford no more real foundation for the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity, than those of the Old Testament do. These two inestimable Revelations of God to man, are both of them harmonious in asserting and maintaining the proper Unity of God. The great author of the christian religion, and his holy Apostles, were as entire strangers to the system of a God the Son, and a God the Holy-ghost, as Moles and the prophets were before them. When they name the Divine Being, they always style him God simply, or God the Father, God our Father, God our Saviour, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord God Almighty; or employ some significant title expressive of his nature and attributes. Whether the word Father be expressed or not, it is always understood where the supreme being is mentioned: for the Evangelists and Apostles knew of no other God besides him. They uniformly speak of Jesus as the Messiah, the Christ, the anointed of God, his Servant, Messenger,

Messenger, and Son, and assign the reasons on which this last title is founded; none of which imply Divinity, or derivation from the Father's essence or substance. The Holy Spirit is with them, the power, energy, operation, and inspiration of God. In short the Unitarian doctrine is clearly demonstrable from the Scriptures; and the Trinitarian objections to it, are all of them founded on false readings, mis-translations, or erroneous explanations of the sacred volume, which are capable of a clear and satisfactory solution, and I humbly trust have been solidly answered in these Discourses. The more the Scriptures are examined with accuracy and critical skill; the Falsity of the Trinitarian system appears the more conspicuous. How pleasing is it to observe Reason and Revelation go hand in hand; and mutually unite in establishing the Unity of the Divine nature. A truth of the last Importance, but which the greatest part of Christians for a series of Ages have unhappily departed from. May it please the Father of lights, the source of wisdom, to enlighten their minds, remove their prejudices, and bring them to the full knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus. To him, the Lord God Almighty, the blessed and the only potentate, who is, and who was, and who is to come, who sitteth upon the throne, who liveth for ever and ever, and for whose pleasure all things were and are created; be ascribed all glory, honour, and power; from all his rational offspring. Amen.

DISCOURSES ON THE DIVINE UNITY,

DISCOURSE XI.

John Chap. xvii. Ver. 2. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent,

THIS solemn declaration of Jesus Christ our Lord, that his Father, "is the only true God," being one of the most explicit and significant attestations that the whole scripture affords, in favour of the personal Unity of the Divine Being; we therefore selected it at first, as a proper foundation for all our reasonings on this subject; and proposed by an appeal to the scriptures at large, to enforce and establish the following propositions.

First, That there is one person, or intelligent agent, who alone is God, supreme, almighty, and eternal; and that this one person is the Father, or as he is sometimes called in scripture, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God.

Secondly, That Jesus Christ is not the most high God; but a being inferior to him, dependent upon him, and acting by his command and authority; or in other words, his Son, Servant, and Messenger, and by the Father's appointment, the Messiah, or only Mediator between God and man. That they might know Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

And Thirdly, and Lastly, To consider and answer the objections, that the Trinitarians make to our hypothesis,
and

and urge in support of their own, founded on various places both of the Old and New Testament.

Every part of this plan has now been fully executed. In the three first Discourses the one sole Godhead of the Father was demonstrated. In the three following ones, the subordinate and inferior nature of our Lord Jesus Christ, as the subject and creature of God, was established and ascertained, by the most clear and positive proofs. And in the four last Discourses, the objections of Unitarians founded on various passages of the Old and New Testament, were particularly examined, and completely answered: and the Holy Spirit, or Spirit of God, was shown from the genuine application of the words in Scripture, to be either the Father himself; or to denote his power, influences, operation, or inspiration.

Having thus completed all we undertook to perform, there remains nothing more for us now to do, but briefly to suggest some considerations which naturally arise from the subject. The Doctrine of a Trinity in Unity is one of the strangest riddles, that ever entered into the mind of man. To say that three persons are One God, and One God is three persons, is the highest pitch of inconsistency, and nothing more manifestly contradictory can be imagined. It confounds and disarranges all our Ideas, and destroys all the principles of sound and just reasoning. The man who can calmly admit this doctrine, must for ever part with reason in religion, and has no criterion left him for distinguishing truth from error. He may go on to the belief of any other absurdity, and has no pretence for rejecting even the Doctrine of Transubstantiation itself. It is so palpably inconsistent with the nature of things, that some who have held and contended for the doctrine itself, could not bear to see it drawn out and fully expressed in words. "The word Trinity (says Luther,) sounds oddly and is an human invention: it were better to call Almighty God, God, than Trinity." And Calvin observes in like manner. "I like not this prayer, O holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity! It savours of barbarity: the word Trinity

" is

“ is barbarous, insipid, profane, a human invention, grounded on no testimony of God’s word, the popish “ God, unknown to the prophets and apostles.” † All the real believers of this triple Godhead, (for the nominal and modal Trinitarians are only disguised Unitarians,) are guilty of a plain breach of the first sacred commandment of God to man, “ Thou shalt have no other Gods before me. They dishonour the one God and Father of all, by giving away his peculiar glory to another, and associating and comprehending other beings in the Godhead with him, who alone is the only sovereign Lord of the Universe. They do this no doubt ignorantly, from the prejudices of education, and a mistaken apprehension of the scriptures, but their idolatry is not the less real on that account. Whoever acknowledges more Gods than one is an idolater, according to the scripture definition of the word; and no pretended Unity of essence, or of nature, can ever make three distinct divine agents to be one God. Divines may amuse themselves, and deceive others, with scholastic jargon, arbitrary and unmeaning distinctions, and terms of human invention, they may cry out mystery, ineffable mystery; but the nature of things will not be altered or changed. A God the Father, a God the Son, and a God the Holy ghost, distinguished by their personal properties; and possessing each of them all the proper attributes of the divine nature, will still be three Gods, after all the unavailing attempts to prove them one God. As the doctrine of three divine persons or intelligent agents, infers a breach of the first command, so in like manner, the incarnation of God, or the supposed Union of the divine and human natures in Jesus Christ; which the Trinitarians also maintain, necessarily implies a violation of the second precept of the decalogue. That precept strictly prohibits the worshipping of the one true God, under any bodily form or appearance whatever; and consequently those who acknowledge and adore Jesus Christ as God, do manifestly transgress this command. “ For (as an able writer observes,) when the Protestants in-
voke

“ yoke the one Almighty Lord of Heaven and earth
 “ by his nativity and circumcision, his agony and bloody
 “ sweat, his cross and passion, his death and burial, they
 “ represent to us the bodily form of their deity, as plain
 “ as if they placed a crucifix before our eyes. And ac-
 “ cordingly they are not the churches and books of de-
 “ votion of Roman Catholics only, in which images and
 “ pictures are to be found of the human deity, or the
 “ God-Man, as the orthodox affect to call him, whom
 “ both Papists and Protestants adore as the only true
 “ God.” † It is evident then, that the Trinitarian faith
 and worship is idolatrous in two respects: and it is
 truly surprising that rational creatures can continue in
 the belief and profession of a system, so contrary to the
 word of God, and the nature of things. An eminent
 Philosopher, and one of the greatest geniuses that this
 kingdom ever produced, gave the following definition
 of christianity, as it is exhibited, or rather disguised, in
 certain creeds and articles. “ A christian is one that be-
 “ lieves things his reason cannot comprehend—He believ-
 “ es three to be one, and one to be three; a Father
 “ not to be older than his Son; a Son to be equal to
 “ his Father; and one proceeding from both, to be e-
 “ qual with both; he believing three persons in one na-
 “ ture, and two natures in one person.” § But the
 doctrine of the Trinity is not merely an absurdity, a
 speculative error, an idolatrous system: but if consistent-
 ly adhered to and followed out, it must also have the worst
 effects in regard to practical religion; and tend to debase
 the nature of true genuine piety. When men once come
 to believe that there are more divine persons than one,
 they very naturally ascribe different qualities and proper-
 ties to them: accordingly the Trinitarians tell us that
 God the Father supports the majesty of the Godhead, and
 therefore they assign to him a strict inflexible justice, that
 lays him under a necessity of pardoning no sin, without

† Evanston's letter to the Bishop of Litchfield and
 Coventry.

§ Lord Bacon.

an infinite satisfaction, in order to vindicate the honour of his broken law. God the Son it seems according to them, possesses no such inflexible Justice. for he not only forgives sin without any atonement, but makes an infinite satisfaction to the Father himself. God the Holy Ghost, neither satisfies nor is satisfied, and therefore must be supposed as well as the Son, to forgive sin freely. There are many absurdities and inconsistencies attending this monstrous scheme of Divinity: but I shall only take notice of such as belong to the present subject. It is obvious, that while God the Father is considered in this unamiable light, that the affections of his creatures must be transferred from him to the other two persons. The Holy Ghost will appear a more gracious and merciful being than the Father; because he requires no satisfaction; and the Son will appear still more amiable than the Holy Ghost; because he not only forgives sin freely; but satisfies the Father's offended Justice. Thus the God and Father of all, will be unjustly deprived of the love of his creatures, and the noblest incentive to sincere contrition, repentance, and reformation, will be taken away. For who can love a Being, that appears cruel, rigorous, and severe; and divested of all those qualities which naturally beget pious and devout affections. Again, the scheme of three co-equal divine persons, renders it impossible to love the Lord our God, with all the heart, soul, and mind, as he has strictly commanded us to do. We cannot center our supreme love upon three different objects. The highest affections of the human mind are incapable of being divided. And we shall be led to esteem and regard, some of these supposed divine persons more highly than others, in proportion as we conceive them to be more or less favourably disposed towards us. This System, is therefore unfavourable to rational piety and true devotion; and must have a tendency to produce superstition and Enthusiasm. It distracts and confounds the mind of the worshipper, by presenting three different objects before him, each of whom possessing all divine perfections, are equally

ly entitled to that utmost reverence and love which can only be given to one.

There are some of the sad consequences resulting from this Trinitistic scheme of religion, but they are not the only ones. The doctrine of the Trinity has had other baneful effects, by impeding the progress of Christianity in the world, and preventing the conversion of Deists, Jews, Mohammedans, and Pagans. It is true, we ought not to give up any essential part of our religion, to please unbelievers of any denomination; nor is it allowable to shape the doctrines of Christianity according to the fancies and caprice of men. But this doctrine, being no part of the faith once delivered to the Saints; but a most flagrant corruption of it; it is truly melancholy to reflect, how much the religion of Jesus has suffered on that account. The Deists in our own country, taking their notions of Christianity from the creeds, articles, and confessions, of our national establishments; and not giving themselves the trouble to examine the New Testament with critical care and skill, have taken it for granted that this tenet is contained in that incomparable book; and have assigned it as one of their reasons for rejecting the Christian faith. The Jews although in the early periods of their history remarkably prone to idolatry; and severely punished by the Divine Being on that account; have yet ever since their return from the Babylonish captivity, preserved uncorrupted among themselves, the faith and worship of one living and true God; and are really a standing reproach to Christians. The doctrine of the Trinity, is one of their principal objections against Christianity. They look upon it with the utmost abhorrence, as an impious idolatrous system, inculcating the belief of more divine persons than one; and raising the creature to the dignity of the creator. Let a Trinitarian endeavour to convert a Jew to the belief of his own tenets; and he will tell him that the law of God, the revelation of the Almighty in the Old Testament, forbids it. He will tell him, that he will never give up the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of Moses, and the Prophets, the one adorable Jehovah, the God of Israel, who was the God of his ancestors,

for

for this new God, this triune Deity, that Christians have devised. The creeds and public offices of devotion of the Jews, are formed upon principles diametrically opposite to those of trinitarians — One article of their creed is this, “ I believe with an entire faith, that God the creator, is one person, and that the Unity or oneness which is in him is not in any other.” And a hymn which is in daily use among them contains the following words, “ And God shall be king over all the earth: in that day there shall be one God and his name one, (Zachariah, xiv. 9) in like manner as it is written in thy law, Hear, O Israel, God our God is one God. This (says the author from whom this quotation is taken,) is so drawn up by them in opposition to the belief of Christians, as though we adored more Gods than one, or gave him more names than one, viz. that of Christ.” § The Mohammedans have also testified the strongest aversion to the doctrine of the Trinity; and have severely reproached Christians for their adherence to it. The general prevalence of that doctrine, gave Mohammed the greatest advantages in propagating and establishing his new religion. That impostor arrogated to himself the title of the prophet and messenger of God, sent to reclaim mankind from idolatry; and restore the true worship of the divine being. He borrowed his just notions of the Divine Unity from the sacred scriptures of the Old and New Testament, which he owned to be true revelations from God; but blamed Christians for departing from them. He had either the sagacity or good fortune to discover in the bible, what many Christian divines have not found, or affected not to find there. Amidst all the rubbish and extravagance with which the Koran abounds, the Divine Unity is a truth that shines there with distinguished lustre; and in the opinion of some contributed not a little, to forward the rapid progress of Mohammedanism in the world. The Mohammedans particularly

§ Buxtorf. *Synagoga Judaica*, p. 165, as quoted by Mr Lindsey in his *Apology*. p. 90, 91.

ticularly value themselves upon this one article of their creed; and style themselves Moslems or believers, on account of it. Christians they make no scruple to call infidels and idolaters; nor is there the smallest hope, that ever they will renounce their attachment to their pretended prophet; until Christianity is exhibited to them under a very different form, than what prevails in most Christian countries, and the belief of one only God, or divine person, is fairly and unequivocally acknowledged. † Nor can the conversion even of Pagans be expected, while this doctrine continues to be held and taught by Christians. Every argument by which we would attempt to convince them of the absurdity of a multiplicity of Gods, will be found to militate equally strong against a Trinity of Divine persons. “ One may read (says Eralyn) in Le Comptre’s history of China, how the heathens derided the Christians’ doctrine of a mortal God; and upon that

† As a proof of what has been advanced above, of the aversion and irreconcilable antipathy of the Mohammedans, to the doctrine of the Trinity, the following passages from the Koran may be selected. Sura. 4. “ O ye who receive the scriptures, exceed not the proper bounds of your religion, and say nothing of God unless the truth ” “ Undoubtedly, Jesus Christ the Son of Mary is the “ ambassador of God, and his word which he sent into “ Mary, and a spirit from him. Believe therefore in “ God and his ambassador, and say not there are three “ Gods. Forbear this assertion, it will be the better for “ you.” Sura 5. “ They were infidels, who affirmed “ ed that Christ the Son of Mary is God.”———“ They “ were infidels who said, “ certainly the Messiah the Son “ of Mary is God.” For the Messiah’s words were these, “ “ O children of Israel worship God my Lord, and your “ Lord.” Certainly those who assign to God a companion, God will exclude them from Paradise; and they “ shall be lodged in a habitation of fire: and those who “ act wickedly shall have none to protect them. They are “ infidels who say “ certainly God is three persons:” For “ there

“ that account esteemed Christianity as fabulous as their
 “ own religion. And Dr Gausabon in his book of cre-
 “ dulity and incredulity says, he could prove by many
 “ instances out of history, that this doctrine has kept
 “ more people from embracing the christian faith, than
 “ any other thing he knew of.” ‡ One memorable in-
 stance of the truth of this assertion, out of many others,
 I shall just now mention. About the beginning of the
 present century, the King of Denmark sent some Lu-
 theran divines, as missionaries to the province of Mala-
 bar in the East Indies; in order to convert the inhabi-
 tants

‡ Evelyn's works Vol. 1. p. 129. 130. Lond. 1745.

“ there is only one God, and none else besides him. And if
 “ they forbear not such assertions, it is most certain,
 “ that God will punish them with grievous torments.
 “ Let them therefore return to God, and solicit his
 “ forgiveness: for he is indulgent and merciful.” Al-
 koran. Ed. Martelli. Patavii 1698. The authors of
 the Universal history give account of the following pro-
 fession of the Divine Unity, by Mohammed: “ God is
 “ great. There is no God but God: he has no com-
 “ panion: he is the only supreme Governor: he only
 “ ought to be praised: he is powerful above all things:
 “ There is no God but God: he has no companion: he
 “ only is strong: he has succoured his servant; and he
 “ alone has put to flight legions of his enemies.” The
 same authors give us the following prayer, offered up by
 two Mohammedans, before engaging in battle. “ O
 “ God, help us, we beseech thee, against these wretch-
 “ es, (viz. the christians) who pray with idolatrous ex-
 “ pressions, and take to themselves another God be-
 “ sides thee. Help us O God who acknowledge thy
 “ Unity, and affirm that there is no other God but thou
 “ alone, for the sake of thy prophet Mohammed against
 “ these idolaters.” Modern Universal History Vol. 1. p.
 214. 289. It is evident, that Mohammed and his follow-
 ers derived these sublime Ideas concerning the Divine
 Unity from the Scriptures, particularly the book of
 Psalms and that of Isaiah.

tants of that country from idolatry to the belief of christianity. These missionaries had many conferences with the natives, on various theological topics; and were at very great pains to shew them the absurdity of their own religion; and induce them to change it. The following quotation, is part of a conference betwixt a Malabarian Physician from Nagapattinam, and one of these Missionaries. Missionary. "God does not appear in
 "bodily shape, said I: for he is a spirit; but he has ap-
 "peared and revealed himself by his Son Jesus Christ,
 "who clothed himself with the garments of mor-
 "tality, to the end he might suffer for our sins,
 "reconcile us to God, and bring us to him, and
 "to do his will; which is our Salvation. If you be-
 "lieve in Christ the Redeemer of Mankind, your mind
 "will be more and more enlightened in the knowledge
 "of the Supreme Being. Who is his Son, said he?
 "(viz the Physician) And is he also God? I answer-
 "ed, he is God blessed for ever. But pray Sir, recol-
 "lect yourself, said he, have not you been just now
 "inveighing against plurality of Gods. And now I find,
 "you have yourselves more than one; the Father is
 "God, and the Son is God; then you have two Gods.
 "I answered we do not believe two Gods, but one only
 "God; tho' at the same time we firmly believe, that
 "there are three persons in one divine essence; and
 "yet these three persons are not three, but one God;
 "and this we believe as a great mystery, transcending
 "our weak finite faculties. We are satisfied, that 'tis
 "a revealed truth in Scripture; and God, who knows
 "himself, has enjoined us to believe a Trinity of per-
 "sons in one divine essence; which we call Father,
 "Son, and Holy Ghost. If God has a Son, said he,
 "then your God as well as some of ours, must have a
 "wife, and is by consequence, a material Being. God is
 "a Spirit said I, and therefore has no bodily shape, and
 "consequently could not have a Son in the ordinary way
 "of generation; but without any knowledge of a con-
 "sort, he begat his Son from eternity, by generation
 "not to be paralleled in time; and from Father and
 Son

" Son proceeds the Holy Spirit, the third person in the
 " blessed Trinity; which tho' to us mortals incompre-
 " hensible; yet the possibility thereof may be shadowed
 " forth by an easy familiar comparison. Out of the
 " immaterial soul of man proceeds, and is born the Un-
 " derstanding; and from the essence of the soul, and
 " the Understanding, emanates or proceeds the will; and
 " yet the soul, (as to its essence) the Understanding, and
 " the Will, are really but one and the same thing. The
 " Application thereof is easy to the doctrine of the
 " Trinity as far as divine things may be compared to
 " things created, that are within our Ken. I find,
 " said he, that you with subtil ways of arguing, can
 " make a trinity consistent with Unity; and if your ex-
 " plication is absolutely necessary to make others under-
 " stand what you mean, pray, allow us the same advan-
 " tage of explaining the doctrine of our religion, and
 " putting it in the favourablest light we can, for the ex-
 " cluding of the absurdities imputed to us. And
 " this once granted us, 'twill follow, that our plurality
 " does not destroy the Unity of God, no more than your
 " Trinity does. We worship the Gods upon no other
 " account, than because they are the Vicegerents of the
 " Almighty, whose administration he employs in govern-
 " ing the world, as he did employ them at the beginning
 " in creating and forming the same. And our God ap-
 " pearing among men at sundry times under different
 " shapes, had at every apparition a different name given
 " him, which contributed very much to the multiplying
 " the number of our images; whereas in truth, they are
 " but different representations of the same God, under
 " different aspects and appearances " † This passage is
 too plain to need any comment; and it is evident from
 it, that Pagans may and do justify themselves in the faith
 and worship of any number of Gods whatever, by the
 very same arguments that a Trinity of divine persons is
 defended. They can easily invent comparisons and falla-
 cious

† Thirty four Conferences between the Danish Mission-
 aries and the Malabarian Bramans, translated from the
 High Dutch by Mr. Phillips, London. 1719.

arious modes of reasoning; and may with the same propriety make a specific Deity out of their numerous Gods or divine persons as the Trinitarians do out of three; or may have recourse to other metaphysical subtilities, and talk of personalities, subsistencies, modes, and relative properties: and thus any system of idolatry may be contended for, upon the same principles by which a Trinity of divine persons is maintained. The Papists harden themselves in the belief of Transubstantiation, by comparing it to the doctrine of the Trinity; and when the absurdity of the former opinion is charged upon them by protestants declare, that the one is not less contrary to reason than the other. And it is no difficult matter to trace the rise of the whole system of Popery, from this one article alone. When men once went the length to exalt Christ to a proper equality with God Almighty, they were naturally led to pay religious honours and worship to his mother Mary in the next place; and from thence proceeded to the invocation of Saints and Angels, and the adoration of a bread and God. These are the dismal effects that have followed, from a departure from the faith and worship of the Father, the one only living and true God: and it is only by the restoration of this capital and original article of the Jewish and Christian Revelation, that the downfall of Popery may be expected; and the general reception of Christianity in the world at large can be secured. May the Divine being bring it speedily about, that the Gospel may become a common blessing to all the nations of the earth; and have that proper influence on the minds and actions of men, which its genuine and uncorrupted doctrines are so well calculated to produce. The Unitarian System has of late years, made a considerable progress in the southern parts of this united kingdom: and has now many able and zealous advocates; who openly profess it, and employ their learning and talents in its defence. From the continued exertions, and repeated efforts of these excellent persons; it is to be expected, that this great and good cause will prevail more and more, and that the prejudices of those who oppose the truth, will be gradually mitigated; and

at last effectually removed. Some of these advocates for Unitarianism, have given the most unequivocal proofs of sincerity, by resigning church-preferments, and submitting to great temporal inconveniences; for the sake of enjoying that inestimable treasure, a good conscience. And this brings me naturally to speak of the conduct of those, who being convinced of the one sole Godhead of the Father, do yet continue to conform to Trinitarian worship; and remain in churches, wherein religious sentiments diametrically opposite to their own are the standard of doctrine; and constantly taught and inculcated. A conduct of this kind is justly censurable, particularly in laymen, who have little to sacrifice by acting up to the dictates of truth and sincerity. The fidelity we owe to God and his truth, requires us to bear an open and consistent testimony to it; which we can never be said to do, while we stately frequent those churches, in which error is openly enforced and recommended. To speak in favour of the truth is no doubt highly commendable, and tends to diffuse the knowledge of it in the world: but example has still a far more powerful effect. The edifying example of one or more persons, retiring from conscientious motives, from the communion of a corrupt and erroneous church, will be far more efficacious, and make a deeper impression upon the greatest part of mankind; than the clearest and most conclusive reasoning whatever. The difference of opinion betwixt Unitarians, and Trinitarians, is not of a light and trivial nature. It is not a verbal disputation, a poor play of words, a contest about ceremonies, forms, or church government; but a matter of the last importance. The honour and glory of God, the least part of which is greater than the greatest human affairs, is deeply concerned. † The credit of the religion of Jesus is at stake. If ever there was a cause, that would justify or require a separation from any church in earth, it is a conviction that the one true God our heavenly Father is there dishonoured; and his peculiar glory given to another.

† ——gloria divina hinc agitur, cujus pars minima rebus humanis etiam maximis major est. Crellius de uno Deo Patre, in prefatione.

ther. Far be it from me, to pass any rash and uncharitable censures upon those, who do this ignorantly, having no opportunity of being better informed: or from invincible prejudices that cannot be overcome. I acknowledge and admit the innocency of unavoidable error. But I am speaking just now to Unitarians, whom God in his providence has brought out of darkness into his marvellous light; and I am sure it is their duty to act in conformity to the light that God hath afforded them; by an open avowal of their principles, a resolute departure from those societies where false doctrines are taught, and an unscriptural worship prevails; and thereby increasing the number of the true worshippers of the Father in spirit and in truth, and setting an instructive example of religious integrity to the world. † As for us my my Brethren, who have already taken this course, and formed a little church, the very basis of which is the one only Godhead of the Father, let us adhere steadily to this grand and important principle; and take every opportunity that the providence of God puts in our power, of propagating the truth; and gaining the assent of Mankind to it. Let us not be intimidated by the number of our opponents, or the malevolence and bitterness of spirit that some of them display against us; which in truth discovers the weakness of their cause, that can only be supported by violence and clamour, and has no solid foundation in reason or the Scriptures. Let us be punctual in the discharge of all moral and religious duties, doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with God. Now to the one living and only true God the Father, the perpetual and absolute Sovereign of the Universe; who made the heavens, the earth, the sea, and all that in them is; and who has no equal in the supremacy of his perfections and dominion; be ascribed through Jesus Christ our Lord, all possible glory, and praise, both now and ever. Amen.

† See these hints to conforming Unitarians much farther pursued in a treatise entitled, A free and serious address to the christian Laity, especially such as embracing Unitarian Sentiments conform to Unitarian worship. Lond. 1781.

To be Sold by DAVID BUCHANAN,
Bookseller in MONTROSE, viz.

I.

An Appeal to the Serious and Candid Professors of Christianity on the following subjects, London, 1783, price, 2d viz.

I. The Use of Reason in Matters of Religion.

II. The power of Man to do the will of God.

III. Original Sin.

IV. Election and Reprobation.

V. The Divinity of Christ.

VI. Atonement for Sin by the Death of Christ.

To which is added the Trial of Mr ELWALL, &c.

2.

A Familiar Illustration of certain passages of Scripture, on the above Subjects. London, 1772, price, 4d.

3.

A Catechism for Children and Young Persons. London, 1781, price, 4d.

4.

A Scripture Catechism, consisting of a Series of Questions, with references to the Scriptures instead of Answers. price, 4d.

The Above four Tracts

By JOSEPH PRIESTLEY, L. L. D. F. R. S.

5.

A Friendly Dialogue between a common Unitarian Christian and an Athanasian. London, 1784, price,

6.

An Appeal to the Common Sense of all Christian People, more particularly the Members of the Church of England, with regard to an important point of Faith and Practice, imposed upon their Consciences by Church Authority; or, A preservative against the main principles, on which Popery and Infidelity are founded; with

With a distinct Reply to a Letter to the Common People, &c. by the Rev. MR JONES. 3d. Edition, London, 1775, price, 3s.

By a COUNTRY CLERGYMAN.

7.

The Catechist; or. An Inquiry into the Doctrine of the Scriptures, concerning the only true God and object of Religious Worship. London, 1781, price 1s. 6d.

By the Rev. THOPHILUS LINDSEY, A. M.

8.

An Elucidation of the Unity of God, deduced from Scripture and Reason, addressed to Christians of all Denominations. price, 1s

By I. G. ESQUIRE.

9.

An Attempt to explain certain passages of Scripture, generally misunderstood, by Philalethes. London, 1784, price, 9d.

10.

A Free and Serious Address to the Christian Laity, especially such as embracing Unitarian Sentiments conform to Trinitarian Worship. To which is prefixed an introduction; wherein the Worship of the holy Scriptures is contrasted with the Worship of the Church of England, and of Dissenters. London, 1781, price, 1s. 6d.

11.

An Humble Attempt to investigate and defend the Scripture Doctrine concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. 2d. Edition, Edin. 1784, price, 2s stitched.

By JAMES PURVES.

12.

Predestination, calmly considered. 5th Edition

By JOHN WESLEY, M. D.

ERRATA.

| FOR. | READ. | FOR. | READ. |
|----------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| p. 41. 24 counsel | council | p 451. 25 their | there |
| 7. 37. underweat | under- went | 46. 31 pregenitor | proge- nitor |
| 13. 34. whither | whether | 48. 14 Evangelists | Evan- gelists |
| 15. 17. their | there | 24. similiar | similar |
| 6. 17. corroborates | corrobo- rates | 52. 7. bring | bring |
| 26 Dens | Deus | 57. 12. deitly | deity |
| 9 8. dependant | dependent | 57. 16. fourthy | fourthly |
| 10. 6. Milne | Note Mill | 27. ambassador | embal- lador |
| 11. 12. the | thee | 63 12. ubraid | upbraid |
| 12. 13. provos | proves | 64. 3. proposterous | pre- posterous |
| 16. Septugiut | Septua- giut | 25 commandmens | com- mandments |
| 30. us | use | 67. 28. aluded | alluded |
| 15. 38 Jehovah's | Jehovahs | 68. 10. man | men |
| 24. 11. lu | us | 31. iame | image |
| 31. strenthened | strengthen- ed | 69. 25. genitive | genitive |
| 25. 19. Apofiles, | Aposle's | 70. 2. decleres | declares |
| 27. 29. have | have | 71. 13. proffession | pro- fession |
| 30. 35. dele | the | 72. 2. fo | to |
| 33. 13. choice | chuse | 73. 26. mediatorial | me- diatorial |
| 25. exhibiteted | exhi- bited | 30. perenthesis | paren- thesis |
| 34 absolutly | absolutely | 79. 9. proffessors | professors |
| 34. 5 pssaages | passages | 87. 31. divines | divine |
| 17. begotten | begotten | 90. 31. thair | there |
| 38. 3 beyond | beyond | 92. 5 irresistibly | irresistibly |
| 21. Either | Father | 93 note 4 filys | filius |
| 39. 23. porperty | property | 102. 37. proffessed | profes- sed |
| 40. note 4. accademy | ac- demy | 104. 9 dearnesse | clearness |
| 42. 6 other | other | 105 1. Trinitatist | |
| 27. flall | shall | | |

E R R A T A.

| FOR. | READ. | FOR. | READ. |
|--------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|---|
| p. 105 l. 1 | Trinitarian Tri- nitarian | p. 200 l. 14 | disparagingly dis- paragingly |
| 108 38. | objection objec- tions | 203. 11. | Futher Father |
| 109. 24 | Jospeh's Joseph's | 204. 22. | Messiahship Messi- ahship |
| 128. 33. | limited limited | 215. 2. | consequensea conse- quences |
| 133 15 | nature nature | 217. 28. | whither whether |
| 139 note 2 | Stepen's Ste- phen's | 223. 7. | amigous ambiguo- ous |
| 149. 27. | begining begin- ning | 225. 5. | proffessing profes- sing |
| 150 11. | attenting attend- ing | 227 note 2. | Cambridge. Claramontaine |
| 151. 33. | trespases trespass- ses | 234 35 | proffessed profes- sed |
| 153. 16. | strenght strength | 242. 24. | propable probable |
| 158. 20. | blind blind | 244 note 2. | Ephrem E- phrem |
| 159 14 | whither whether | 245. 39. | chaper chapter |
| 160 11. | imparred imparted | 249. 37. | proffession profes- sion |
| 161 note 2. | prebæt præbet | 251. 21 | knowledge righ- teousness |
| 170. 1. | thy Father the Father | 252. 24 | scripture scripture 38 manited manifest- ed |
| 170. 24 | mission mission | 254 1. | proffessor profes- sor |
| 184. 19. | ho Theos ipa Theos | 257. 28. | whither whether |
| 186. 36. | voliace violence | 259 16. | saith faith |
| 187. 18. | beginning begin- ning | 17. | this this |
| 187 note 12. | redicule ridi- cule | 261. 39 | the thee |
| 189. 22. | Hebrwa Hebrews 6. Targum's Targums | 264. 11. | futerity futurity |
| 191. 18. | comibutor com- mentator | 268. 16. | Christ Christ |
| 193 6. | there their | 269. 8. | prooffs proofs |
| 196 39 | Necodamus Nic- odemus | 271. 32. | different different |

A D V E R T I S E M E N T.

TH E Author of these Discourses intended once to have subjoined to them, Animadversions on Monsieur Abbadie's Treatise, concerning the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, in order to point out the inconclusive reasoning, unmeaning declamation, and erroneous criticisms; with which that lively but verbose and superficial writer abounds. But finding these Animadversions likely to increase to a greater bulk than he at first imagined, he thinks it best to reserve them as the subject of a separate Pamphlet, with references to these Discourses. The Author is now engaged in this Work; and if Monsieur Abbadie's Treatise continues to be printed, he will put his Animadversions to the press as soon as finished.





